

1720
New Series

Volume XI, Number 44

JAN 23 1961
November 1960
PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language

Editors: PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

CONTENTS

The 'Rubens' Manuscript and <i>Archbishop Ælfric's Vocabulary</i> . By C. A. Ladd	353
The Poems of Nicholas Hare. By John Carey	365
The 'Tree of Life' Symbolism in <i>Paradise Regain'd</i> . By John M. Steadman	384
Wordsworth, Coleridge, and the <i>Morning Post</i> : An Early Version of 'The Seven Sisters'. By Carol Landon	392
Matthew Arnold's 'The Strayed Reveller'. By Leon A. Gottfried	403

NOTES

Edward Daunce and <i>The Unfortunate Traveller</i> (Philip Drew)	410
Notes on Swift and Johnson (Christopher Ricks)	412

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

The Metre of *Beowulf*, by A. J. Bliss, 414; The Art of *Beowulf*, by Arthur Gilchrist Brodeur, 417; The Salisbury Psalter, edited by Celia Sisam and Kenneth Sisam, 419; The French Text of the *Ancrene Riwle*, edited by W. H. Trethewey, 421; Early English Stages 1300-1600, by Glynne Wickham, Vol. I, 423; The Traditional Tunes of the Child Ballads, with their Texts, according to the Extant Records of Great Britain and America, by Bertrand Harris Bronson, Vol. I, 426; More Talking of Shakespeare, edited by John Garrett, 428; Thomas Heywood et le drame domestique élisabéthain, by Michel Grivelet, 429; The Life Records of John Milton, by J. Milton French, Vol. V, 431; Alexander Pope. The Poetry of Allusion, by Reuben Arthur Brower, 432; Dr. Burney's Musical Tours in Europe, edited by Percy A. Scholes, 434; William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esq., by Charles Ryskamp, 436; Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*. A Variorum Edition, edited by Lawrence John Zillman, 438; Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, edited by Earl Leslie Griggs, Vol. III and Vol. IV, 439; The Maturity of Dickens, by Monroe Engel, 440; The Novels of George Eliot, by Barbara Hardy, 443; The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins, edited by Humphry House, completed by Graham Storey, and The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins, edited by Christopher Devlin, S.J., 445; The Art of Rudyard Kipling, by J. M. S. Tompkins, 447; The Critical Writings of James Joyce, edited by Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann, 448; Textual and Literary Criticism, by Fredson Bowers, 449; The Place-Names of Derbyshire, by Kenneth Cameron, 451; Short Notices, 453; Summary of Periodical Literature, 455; Index, 460.

N;
CY
ER-
N;

the
he
not
be
is
rd

ur
nd
oy
ne
th
nd
e
of
ne
ry
rs
er
A
rs
l.
ls
y
d
s,
e
,



THE 'RUBENS' MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHBISHOP ÆLFRIC'S VOCABULARY

By C. A. LADD

A WELL-KNOWN stumbling-block for students of Anglo-Saxon is the fact that references in Bosworth-Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* to 'Ælfc. Gl.' are not, except on the comparatively rare occasions when they are followed by the letters 'Z(up).', to the familiar *Glossary* of Ælfric printed at the end of Zupitza's edition of the *Grammar*,¹ but to quite a different work, the so-called *Archbishop Ælfric's Vocabulary*. This latter work has been a source of never-ending confusion since William Somner first printed it at Oxford in 1659 as an appendix to his *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*. Somner had decided to end his dictionary with an edition of Ælfric's *Grammar*, but he chose for this purpose a manuscript, British Museum Royal 15 B xxii, the *R* of Zupitza's edition, which unfortunately lacked the *Glossary*.² Somner tells us that he had consulted other manuscripts of the *Grammar*,³ and he no doubt knew that it was generally accompanied by a glossary; but instead of using one of these manuscripts to complete his text, he decided to print a completely distinct work, which he took from a transcript communicated to him by his friend Francis Junius. Junius had in fact conflated two separate items, an incomplete alphabetical glossary and a class-glossary, which had been entered at different times in the margins of a manuscript,⁴ part of which is now MS. no. 47 in the Plantin-Moretus Museum, Antwerp, and part Add. MS. 32246 in the British Museum. The class-glossary at any rate shares a certain amount of material with Ælfric's authentic *Glossary*,⁵ and Somner like later scholars probably regarded the *Vocabulary* as a whole as Ælfric's own expansion of his original work.

¹ Ælfric's *Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. J. Zupitza (Berlin, 1880), pp. 297–322.

² The MS. is incomplete at the end, but probably never contained the *Glossary*. I hope in a forthcoming edition of Ælfric's *Grammar* to discuss the evidence for this, together with the general question of the relationship between the *Glossary* and the *Grammar*.

³ *Ad Lectorem*, § 17. He would almost certainly have seen the MSS. of the *Grammar* in the Cottonian collection, and the St. John's College, Oxford, MS., all of which contain the *Glossary*; see also below, p. 354, n. 4.

⁴ No. 2 in N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), a work to which I am deeply indebted. I have used the facsimile of the complete MS. in the Bodleian Library (MS. Facs. d. 76), to which Ker refers. The facsimile was presented to the Bodleian by Mr. Kenneth Sisam, who informs me that it came to him from the library of W. H. Stevenson. The hand of the alphabetical glossary is assigned by Ker to the beginning of the 11th century; the class-glossary he places slightly later; but see below, p. 363, n. 2.

⁵ See, e.g., below, p. 363, n. 3.

The main text in the manuscript is a work entitled *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, which has been supposed to be a source of Aelfric's *Grammar* itself.¹ Now, according to an entry in the catalogue of the library of the Plantin-Moretus publishing house made in 1592, the collection already in that year possessed a copy of 'Excerptiones ex Prisciano; in pergameno'.² The head of the publishing house then was John Moretus (1543–1610); but the catalogue is described as 'Index Bibliothecæ Plantini', and Christopher Plantin, the founder of the dynasty, lived from 1520, or somewhat earlier, to 1589. It seems hardly reasonable to doubt that the manuscript in the 1592 catalogue is the same as that which in its major portion at any rate is now to be found in the library, and if this is so one would naturally suppose that the manuscript had remained continuously in the Plantin-Moretus collection from at least 1589 to the present day.

Junius and Somner, however, tell a different story. Junius's transcript is preserved in the Bodleian, where it forms manuscript Junius 71.³ In the heading to the *Vocabulary* Junius says that it is taken 'ex membranis Rubenii' (the dots are Junius's own). A note in the transcript adds further information:

Ælfrici præsulis luculentum valdè glossarium, mihi passim dicitur gl. R; non modò in gratam memoriam docti illius generosiq[ue] Rubenii Antwerpiani, mihi benignè prorsus venerabiles membranas indulgentis & communicantis: verùm etiam ut præsens hoc glossarium commodiùs distinguatur ab altero Ælfrici glossario, quod in bibliothecâ Cottonianâ sic adnexum ipsi Grammaticæ deprehenditur, ut cuivis liquere possit ipsum Ælfricum has Glossas suæ addi-
disse Grammaticæ.⁴

Somner amplifies this in the introduction to his dictionary (§ 17):

Glossarium autem illud paulò remotius petutum est: utpote quod ex perve-
tusto quodam exemplari MS. inter Petri Pauli Rubeni, Bruxellensis, ordinis

¹ See below, p. 363, n. 6.

² The portion of the catalogue relating to MSS. is printed by H. Stein in 'Les Manu-
scrits du Musée Plantin-Moretus', *Messager des sciences historiques . . . de Belgique*, 1886
(also separately, Ghent, 1886), pp. 214–18. Our MS. appears as item no. 5 in the list of
folio volumes. Ker mentions three other MSS. of the work as existing or known to have
existed.

³ *Summary Catalogue*, 5182. The note referred to is on a piece of parchment, now
pasted inside the notebook, but originally no doubt forming part of the cover.

⁴ 'The very excellent glossary of Archbishop Aelfric is referred to by me in my writings
as "gl. R", not only in grateful memory of that learned and magnanimous Rubens of
Antwerp, who very kindly gave and communicated to me ancient MSS. [possibly "the
ancient MS."], but also in order that the present glossary might be more conveniently
distinguished from that other glossary of Aelfric, which is to be found in the Cottonian
library, attached to the *Grammar* itself in such a way that anyone can see that Aelfric
himself added these glosses to his *Grammar*.' Junius's transcript of Aelfric's genuine
Glossary is now MS. Junius 72 (S.C., 5183); the text is taken from Cott. Jul. A II, corrected
from Cott. Faust. A x (not mentioned in the *Summary Catalogue* entry) and the incomplete
copy in Harley 107.

equestris viri, & Pictoris præstantissimi, cimelia reperto, à *Francisco Junio, Francisci Filio* viro quidem bonarum artium & linguarum peritissimo, (cui quidam humanissimus *Rubeni*, defuncto patre, filius idem exemplar communicavit:) integrè descriptum, in patriam reductum, ac boni publici promovendi, hujusq[ue] operis sub prelo jam tum sudantis ornandi & absolvendi gratiâ, perhumaniter nostri juris factum fuerit.¹

Junius appears to give his tacit consent to this story, for in his own copy of Somner's dictionary, now manuscript Junius 7 in the Bodleian,² he has changed the words 'ex exemplari *Juniano*', which Somner had substituted for his own 'ex membranis Rubenii', to 'ex membranis *Rubenianis*', while leaving the account in the introduction unaltered.

The son in question is without much doubt Rubens's eldest son, Albert (1614–57). At the time of his father's death on 30 May 1640 at the age of 62 he was only 25 years old; but he was already well known for his archaeological interests, and was the legatee of, among other things, his father's library.³ The second son, Nicholas, was a bare 22 at the time of his father's death and undistinguished; and the two younger sons, Francis and Peter Paul, were small children.⁴ There was some dispute over the distribution of Rubens's property, and it was not perhaps until after the final settlement on 9 April 1646⁵ that the legacy was actually handed over. We know that Junius had had some connexions with the Rubens family, as there is extant in the British Museum a letter to him from the painter dated 1637, thanking him for the gift of a copy of his book *De pictura veterum*.⁶ The fact that the letter is written in Flemish as well as in Latin perhaps implies that the pair were on friendly terms, for Rubens's practice was to write to strangers in Latin or Italian.⁷ Rubens's son Albert, again, was a friend of Isaac Vossius, Junius's nephew.⁸ Rubens in turn was

¹ The *Glossary* on the other hand has been sought from somewhat farther afield [than the *Grammar*], inasmuch as it was copied in its entirety by Francis, son of Francis Junius, a man of great learning in the humane arts and languages, to whom an obliging son of Rubens on the death of his father communicated the said MS., from a very ancient MS. found among the treasures of the famous painter, Sir Peter Paul Rubens of Brussels, brought back to its native land, and very graciously placed at our disposal for the promotion of the public good, and the embellishment and completion of this work which was then already in the press.'

² Summary Catalogue, 5110, where 'Ælfric's glossary' is said to be collated by Junius with MSS. styled 'C, D & T'. It is, of course, the *Grammar* which is thus collated; there are no other MSS. of the *Vocabulary*.

³ M. Rooses in *Biographie Nationale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1886 ff.), xx. 309 ff.; P. Génard, *P. P. Rubens* (Antwerp, 1877), pp. 53 f.

⁴ *Biog. Nat. Belg.* xx. 374.

⁵ Génard, p. 93.

⁶ MS. Harley 4935, ff. 42–43; *Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, ed. R. S. Magurn (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), no. 241; cf. p. 507, where it is suggested that Rubens may have met Junius in London. Miss Magurn has been kind enough to inform me that as far as she knows there is no information to be obtained about the MS. from the Rubens end.

⁷ Magurn, p. 3.

⁸ Burmannus, *Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum* (Leiden, 1727), iii. 684.

intimately acquainted with the Moretus family; but the voluminous correspondence which is known to have existed between him and the current head of the printing house, Balthasar Moretus (1574–1641), has been completely lost, as have been Rubens's papers in general.¹ Nor, as far as I know, is there any trace of the inventory of Rubens's library which Helen Fourment and the guardians of the younger children ordered to be made on 8 June 1640 in the course of the struggle over the distribution of the property.² There would seem to be no documentary evidence remaining to reconcile the conflicting claims of the Rubens and Plantin-Moretus families to the ownership of the manuscript.

The earlier history of the manuscript, in so far as it is known, is certainly consistent with Plantin-Moretus ownership. The ultimate provenance of the manuscript was Abingdon, according to Ker,³ who plausibly suggests that it was bound up in Anglo-Saxon times with his no. 3 (a manuscript of Boethius *De consolatione philosophiae*, now no. 190 in the Plantin-Moretus collection)⁴ and no. 8 (a manuscript of Aldhelm *De virginitate*, now no. 1650 in the Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels, but formerly in the library of the Bollandists at Antwerp)⁵, both of which have insertions by the scribe of the alphabetical glossary. Annotations in the Boethius manuscript show that this at any rate was still in England in the 15th century, but how or when the manuscripts found their way to the Continent is not known.⁶ It seems clear, however, that their history is quite different from that of the English manuscripts from Oxford colleges in the Plantin-Moretus collection, which do not appear in the 1592 catalogue. Ferdinand Vanderhaeghen, it is true, has a story that these manuscripts were given to Christopher Plantin by refugee fellows of All Souls,⁷ which would place them in the collection at a considerably earlier date; but he offers no evidence in support of this, and it is probably a pure guess, like the remark found in a note on a fly-leaf of the Aldhelm manuscript, 'quod ex Anglia allatum, flammisque iconomachorum eruptum coniicio', a remark characterized by Mone as a 'jesuitischer Zusatz'.⁸

However this may be, the Boethius manuscript had certainly found its way to the Continent by 1561, for it was used by Theodore Poelman

¹ Magurn, p. 2.

² *Antwerpisch Archievenblad*, ii (1865), 136; cf. Génard, pp. 53 f.

³ Catalogue, p. 3. Ker does not mention the Rubens connexion.

⁴ In the 1592 catalogue the *Excerptiones* is followed by no. 6, 'Boetius; in pergamento'; but there were other folio copies in the collection.

⁵ Edited in facsimile by G. van Langenhove, *Aldhelm's De Laudibus Virginitatis* (Bruges, 1941).

⁶ The scribe of the class-glossary seems also to be responsible for insertions in the Aldhelm MS.; see Ker.

⁷ *Notice sur la Bibliothèque Plantinienne* (Ghent, 1875), p. 12.

⁸ Quoted in Langenhove, introd., p. 13.

(1512-81) in his edition of the *De consolatione* published by Plantin at Antwerp in 1562,¹ the dedication of which is dated 8 October of the previous year. Poelman, the learned fuller, was from 1558 onwards Plantin's principal editor of classical texts, and his friends are said to have delighted in placing manuscripts at his disposal.² On 1 April 1571 he is reported to have had an edition of the *De virginitate* and four other treatises, said to be by Alcuin, ready for the press, although the edition never in fact saw the light of day.³ If, as seems likely, it is really Aldhelm's work that is referred to here, it may be that Poelman had the Brussels manuscript in his hand at this date. More certainly, the manuscript is said to have belonged to the great geographer Abraham Ortelius (1527-98), though the evidence for this is not without its difficulties.⁴ Ortelius was intimately acquainted with the Plantin-Moretus family, his connexion with Plantin dating from the same period as that of Poelman, and some of his books later formed part of the Plantin-Moretus collection.⁵ A further stage in the history of the Aldhelm manuscript is indicated by the appearance on the fly-leaves of the name of the famous classical scholar, Andrew Schott (1552-1629). Schott, in spite of the difference in age, was a close friend of Ortelius, and an acquaintance of Plantin and Poelman.⁶ From 1597 onwards he was a member of the Jesuit community in Antwerp, and his collection of manuscripts, which he is said to have forwarded to Ortelius from abroad as they were acquired,⁷ came to form part of the Jesuit library,

¹ J. Denucé, *Museum Plantin-Moretus, Catalogue des Manuscrits* (Antwerp, 1927), p. 148.

² Rooses, *Biog. Nat. Belg.*, xvii. 874 ff.; C. Clair, *Christopher Plantin* (London, 1960), p. 43.

³ Rooses, p. 883, quoting an unpublished letter from the archives of the Plantin-Moretus Museum. I regret that I have not had the opportunity to consult these archives personally.

⁴ One of the notes on the paper fly-leaves of the MS. contains material from Bale's account of Aldhelm (see R. Derolez in *Anglia*, lxxiv (1956), 153, n. 1; the edition of Bale used is the Ipswich one of 1548, not the later Basel edition). After quoting the *incipit* of the *De virginitate* from Bale, the annotator adds in parenthesis: 'vidi cala(mo) exaratum apud Abrahamu[m] Ortelium, et ibi vitas s[anctorum] patrum qui continenter vixerunt' (the *mo* of *calamo* has been cut off by the binder; its completion was suggested to me by Prof. J. H. Baxter). The meaning is presumably: 'I have seen a MS. of this work belonging to Abraham Ortelius, together with the lives of the fathers who lived continently'—a curious way of referring to a work which immediately follows in the same MS. A note in a 17th-century transcript of the MS. (quoted in Langenhove, p. 12) definitely states that Ortelius was the owner, but this may simply be an inference from the note in the Aldhelm MS.; the note in the transcript incorporates other material from the fly-leaves of the Aldhelm MS. It would be a great help if the handwriting of the various notes could be identified.

⁵ *Biog. Nat. Belg.*, xvi. 291 ff.; Rooses, *Le Musée Plantin-Moretus* (Antwerp, 1914), p. 226.

⁶ *Biog. Nat. Belg.*, xxii. 1 ff.; L. Maes, *Musée Belge*, ix (1905), 315-18; cf. *Epistulae Ortelianae*, ed. J. H. Hessel (Cambridge, 1887), nos. 113, 146; *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, ed. Rooses and Denucé (Antwerp, 1883 ff.), vii, no. 960. It is perhaps relevant to note that in 1602 Schott was trying to obtain a copy of Bale: *Epist. Ort.*, pp. 765 f.

⁷ Maes, loc. cit.; cf. *Corr. Christ. Plant.*, viii-ix. 282 f.

and so passed to the Bollandists. In spite of Schott's close connexion with Ortelius, however, it was perhaps by purchase rather than by gift or bequest that the Aldhelm manuscript passed into his possession, for a manuscript of Augustine in the Bibliothèque Royale contains a note to the effect that it was purchased by Schott at the public auction of Ortelius's library.¹ A note in another manuscript in the same library fixes the date of the auction as 7 October 1598, three months after Ortelius's death.²

Lest all this be thought to place Plantinian ownership of the Priscian manuscript beyond reasonable doubt, it may be mentioned that Schott in his old age was an acquaintance of Rubens, and on one occasion at any rate borrowed a book from him, according to an anecdote recounted by the painter in one of his letters.³ One does not have to look far to find connexions between prominent men of letters in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In spite of this, it must be admitted that by far the most likely solution of the problem is that the manuscript belonged to the Plantin-Moretus collection, that Rubens had borrowed it and not returned it at the time of his death, and that his son, after lending the manuscript to Junius for copying, discovered its origin and returned it to the collection. It is clear from Somner's account that there is no need to suppose that the manuscript ever left the Continent. Somner's Latin is not very clear, but the words 'in patriam reductum' must refer to the transcript, not to the original manuscript.⁴ They seem to pick up the opening words of the sentence: 'Glossarium autem illud paulò remotius petitum est'; as a result of the act of transcription the *Vocabulary* was returned to its original home, that is, England.

Junius seems to have moved backwards and forwards freely between England and the Low Countries during the period in question.⁵ He was in

¹ J. van den Gheyn, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque royale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1901 ff.), ii, no. 1111. The note reads: 'Liber hic membranaceus ex Angliae calamitate vastatis ab Iconoclastis ecclesiae sub Henrico VIII rege in Belgium venum allatus e Bibliotheca Abrahami Ortelii redemptus est in auctione publica ab And. Schotto Antwerpiano, Soc. Iesu.' A note by the Bollandist D[aniel] P[apebrochius] (1628-1714) adds: 'Collegij Societatis Iesu Antverpiæ, 1598.'

² Ibid, no. 1191. I owe this and the preceding reference to the kindness of Mr. Ker. A note in no. 1348 refers to the same auction, but gives the date wrongly as 1597.

³ Magurn, no. 81, dated 1626. Rubens asks his correspondent to get him another copy of Mariana on the defects in the institution of the Jesuits, as Father Schott has borrowed his copy and had it confiscated by the Provincial of the Order, with a stern reprimand.

⁴ See above, pp. 354 f. My attention was drawn to this point by Mr. Donald Russell.

⁵ For the principal discussions of Junius's life see B. J. Timmer, 'Junius' Stay in Friesland', *Neophilologus*, xli (1957), 141-4. To the list there given should be added De Crane's important 'Bijvoegsel tot de Voorlezing', printed as an addition to the 'Voorlezing over Franciscus Junius' (delivered in 1829) in *Thet Freske Riim*, ed. Epkema (Workum, 1835), in which De Crane suggests a revised date for Junius's visit. Unless otherwise indicated the evidence for Junius's movements will be found in Timmer's article.

Holland on 13 August 1640, two and a half months after Rubens's death, but expecting shortly to return to England;¹ and a letter in Amsterdam suggests that he was back by the end of the year. Junius's brother-in-law, Gerard Vossius, is still writing to him in London in February 1642;² but by April of that year he was once more in Holland as tutor to the young Earl of Oxford, and he seems to have remained in the Low Countries until at least 21 March 1646, on which date Vossius addressed a letter to him at the house of his widowed sister Johanna de Bruyn in The Hague. During this period Junius visited various towns, including Antwerp in 1644. It is perhaps, however, in the period after the final settlement of the Rubens estate on 9 April 1646 that the manuscript is most likely to have reached him. Unfortunately, his movements during the next three years are completely unknown; and Timmer suggests that his two years' stay in Frisia under an assumed name, during which he acquainted himself with the Frisian language, belongs to this period. Certainly it seems to have been at this time that he developed his interest in the history of the Germanic languages. We first hear of him again in 1649, in July of which year Sir Symonds D'Ewes writes to a friend that Junius has been staying with him 'per integrum jam pene semestre', 'for almost a whole six months now';³ and this seems to be confirmed by a letter in Amsterdam. Junius was still in England in May 1650; but by October 1651 he had finally settled in Holland with his half-sister Elizabeth, Vossius's widow,⁴ and remained there for most of the rest of his life. However, the manuscript was pretty certainly back in the Plantin-Moretus collection by 1650, for item no. 69 in the catalogue of manuscripts in the possession of Balthasar Moretus II (1615-74) on 11 July 1650⁵ is 'Priscianus; parvo f[olio],

¹ This information was communicated to me by Dr. Timmer, who has had access to unpublished letters in Amsterdam University Library, of which he has kindly let me see a microfilm copy. Many of Junius's letters to Vossius, together with fair copies of Vossius's own letters, are in the Bodleian Library, and it seems to have been from this collection that Colomesius printed the texts in *G. J. Vossii Epistolae* (London, 1690).

² Bodl. MS. Rawlinson Lett. 84(c), f. 73, dated 4 Feb. o.s., i.e. 14 Feb. The year is not given, but is plainly 1642 from the relation of this to the preceding letter, f. 72 (*Voss. Epist.*, pt. i, no. 433; the original is in Amsterdam), dated 1 Dec., o.s., i.e. 11 Dec., 1641. Cf. B.M. MS. Harley 7012, f. 97, dated 5 Feb. 1641, i.e. 15 Feb. 1642, if this is 'stilo Angliae', like Rawl. Lett. 84(b), f. 203, to the same recipient.

³ MS. Harley 377, f. 190, dated 4 July, o.s., i.e. 14 July, 1649. Haantjes, *Gysbert Japicx* (Amsterdam, 1929), p. 255, n. 2, followed by Timmer, reads 'et' after 'per integrum' which he takes as 'again'; but the sign read 'et' is simply a line-filler. Thus this letter in itself provides no evidence for a previous stay with D'Ewes, though this seems to be implied in the Amsterdam letter, dated 19 Jan., o.s., 1649, unless, of course, this is English style as well as old style, in which case it belongs to the following year.

⁴ Burmannus, *Sylloge*, iii, no. 233, p. 286, dated 17 Oct. 1651 (not November, as Timmer). By a slip this reference has become attached in Timmer's article (p. 142) to another letter entirely, the second of those mentioned in n. 2 above.

⁵ Printed in Stein, 'Les Manuscrits', pp. 218-30. The Boethius MS. on the grounds

charactere mediocre vetustatis', and there seems to be no other manuscript of Priscian in the present collection.

To turn from the manuscript to the work taken from it, the history of the *Vocabulary* after its first printing by Somner is a tale of sad confusion. The work had been attributed by Junius, and, following him, by Somner, to Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury from 995 to 1005. The attribution was based on the existence of a set of verses in honour of the Archbishop at the beginning of the manuscript, and a letter addressed to one 'Æ.' or 'Ælf.', a priest and counsellor of King Cnut, at the end.¹ 'Ælf.' may well be an abbreviation for 'Ælfric', for, though a name *Ælf* seems to be found,² it is rare, and there is no one known of that name who would suit this context. Even so, there is nothing to suggest that the glossaries are the work of the Archbishop, and the identification would certainly never have been made but for the fact that from the time of Bale onwards Archbishop Ælfric was generally assumed to be the same person as the Grammarian.³ The main work in the manuscript is reminiscent of Ælfric's *Grammar*, the glossary material in the margins shows connexions with Ælfric's own *Glossary*, and, curiously enough, one of the other marginal insertions is an actual work of Ælfric, the *Colloquy*,⁴ though Junius gives no indication that he had recognized it as such. It was perhaps natural that the manuscript as a whole should be regarded as a collection of Ælfrician material.

The attribution, and the identification of the two *Ælfrics*, were accepted by Thomas Wright, who in 1857 reprinted the *Vocabulary* direct from Junius's transcript.⁵ The work appears in Wright as two separate items, because he had gathered from a note on p. 84 of the transcript that there were two different glossaries in the manuscript, separated by intervening material.⁶ In fact, the scribe of the class-glossary had to break off for a space at this point, as the margins for some way had already been filled up with other texts. The real division, that between the class-glossary and the alphabetical glossary, was not yet appreciated. In his preliminary note to the *Vocabulary* Wright makes the surprising statement that this is the glossary which 'usually follows Alfric's Anglo-Saxon translation

of size is probably the first of those listed in the catalogue, no. 73, 'Boetius de consolatione; parvo f[olio], vetusto ch[aractere].'

¹ Not 'Ælfr.', as Junius and Somner have it. The letter is perhaps in the same hand as the class-glossary; see below, p. 363, n. 2.

² See Searle's *Onomasticon*, s.n., citing Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.*, no. 931 (*Ælf diacon*, c. 1055—a late copy).

³ See below, p. 361, n. 3. Both Junius and Somner (see his title-page) believed Archbishop Ælfric to be the author of the *Grammar*.

⁴ See G. N. Garmonsway's edition (2nd edn. London, 1947), p. 1, n. 2, and p. 3.

⁵ *A Volume of Vocabularies* (Liverpool, 1857), nos. II and III; cf. p. 1, n. 1, for his identification of the two *Ælfrics*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49, n. 1.

from the Latin Grammar of Priscian', though he admits that it was perhaps considerably modified from its original form;¹ and when he comes to print Aelfric's own *Glossary* later in the volume he adds the note: 'Although there seems to be little room for doubt that the first of the Vocabularies printed in the present volume is rightly ascribed to Alfric, yet in the known manuscripts Alfric's Grammar is followed by a vocabulary which is differently arranged, and more condensed.'²

There was little excuse for this confusion, as Dietrich two years before in his epoch-making study of Aelfric had already established him as a completely different person from the Archbishop, and in fact specifically refers to the *Vocabulary* as a very extended, much later, recension of the *Glossary* which usually accompanied the *Grammar*.³ He emphasized the importance for the study of Aelfric's language of the genuine *Glossary*, which was as yet unprinted except in the modernized version of the *Worcester Fragments*.⁴ Richard Wülcker, who in 1884 re-edited Wright's work,⁵ was aware of Dietrich's study, but instead of taking the opportunity to correct the error over the attribution, he carelessly assumed that Dietrich's researches had proved that *Archbishop Aelfric's Vocabulary* was really the work of Abbot Aelfric, and renamed it accordingly in the table of contents, though not in the running titles.⁶

On the question of the manuscript, Wright, followed by Wülcker, says of the *Vocabulary* that it was transcribed 'from a manuscript in the possession of Reubens [sic] the painter, which is no longer known to exist'. In the same year, however, in which Wülcker published his work, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson realized the connexion between the Junius transcript and the leaves which had recently been acquired by the British Museum, and in the following year he published his findings.⁷ He was misled, however, by the occasional errors in Junius's transcript, and even more by Junius's habit of emending and improving the language of the scribe, and of rearranging the words so as to obtain a more logical order, into supposing

¹ *A Volume of Vocabularies*, p. 15, n. 1.

² Ibid. p. 70, n. 1. The *Glossary* is printed as no. v.

³ *Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie*, xxv (1855), 492, n. 15. (In the subsequent volume of the *Zeitschrift*, pp. 199 ff., Dietrich discusses the earlier theories of Aelfric's identity.) The same warning was given by Miss C. L. White in her revision of Dietrich's work, *Aelfric: A New Study of His Life and Writings* (Boston, 1898), p. 121.

⁴ First published by Sir Thomas Phillipps, *Fragment of Aelfric's Grammar, &c.* (London, 1838). Phillipps assumed the Worcester text to be a later version of *Archbishop Aelfric's Vocabulary*; see his *Preface*. Reprinted as no. vi by Wright, who appreciated that it represented a later version of Aelfric's genuine *Glossary*; p. 87, n. 1.

⁵ *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*, i (London and Marburg, 1884), nos. 4 and 5. Aelfric's own *Glossary* is no. 10; the Worcester version is no. 13. All Wright's original notes are repeated.

⁶ See his *Preface*, p. ii.

⁷ *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, xli (1885), 144–52. For the probable history of the British Museum leaves see Ker, p. 3.

that the manuscript was not the one from which Junius made his copy. It is plain, however, that the transcript cannot go back to a more original text than the one we possess, as it conflates two works which have come together by accident in the margins of our manuscript; and in view of Junius's known habits elsewhere it is reasonable to suppose that it is he who was responsible for the alterations.¹ Maunde Thompson gave a useful collation of the British Museum leaves with the corresponding portions of Wright,² but he perpetuated Wülcker's error over the authorship by attributing the *Vocabulary* to Abbot Aelfric, who was to be distinguished from the Archbishop of the same name. It is only fair to say that the British Museum leaves do not include any of the insertions relating to Archbishop Aelfric, whereas they do contain portions of the text of Aelfric's *Colloquy*.

In the same year Kluge, apparently independently, noted the importance of the British Museum leaves.³ He decided at first against their identity with the 'Rubens manuscript', though he recognized that many of the errors in the transcript could be explained by dependence on the newly discovered text, and that some of the alterations of order might be due to Junius's desire for tidiness. His article gave another useful collation of the text with Wright-Wülcker. Two years later he had changed his mind about the relationship between the leaves and the 'Rubens manuscript', after Sievers had communicated to him his views on Junius's methods as a copyist.⁴ Kluge perhaps deliberately says nothing about the authorship of the *Vocabulary*. In the same year as Kluge's second article Zupitza announced to the Berliner Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen⁵ the discovery of the rest of the manuscript (to which his attention had been directed by Dr. S. Löwenfeld) in the Plantin-Moretus library, which had remained comparatively unknown to scholars until the publication of Vanderhaeghen's work mentioned above.⁶ Zupitza came down heavily on the side of the identity of the complete manuscript with the lost 'Rubens manuscript', and decided that there were insufficient

¹ See below, n. 4, and p. 363, n. 6. This seems to answer the objections raised by H. D. Meritt, *Fact and Lore about Old English Words* (Stanford, 1954), p. 49.

² He says that he is collating the MS. with 'Wright's text, 2nd edition, 1882, corrected by reference to Wülcker's re-edition'. I have not been able to trace such an edition of Wright.

³ *Anglia*, viii (1885), 448-52.

⁴ *Englische Studien*, x (1887), 180.

⁵ Reported in *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, lxxix (1887), 88 f. He had already mentioned the British Museum leaves in passing in connexion with Aelfric's *Colloquy*; *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Alterthum*, xxxi (1887), 43 f.

⁶ See above, p. 356, n. 7. The first proper catalogue of the MSS., though even this is incomplete, was that by Seymour de Ricci in the Paris journal *Revue des bibliothèques*, xx (1910), 217-32. (The entries relating to MSS. of English origin are repeated by Souter, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xx (1918-19), 350 f.) This catalogue is now superseded by that of Denucé mentioned above, p. 357, n. 1.

grounds for attributing the *Vocabulary* to Aelfric; but his promise to treat the manuscript at greater length was not fulfilled.

Such treatment had to wait until 1917, when Max Förster published his fundamental study of the Antwerp portion of the manuscript.¹ In this he distinguished for the first time between the separate elements in the glossary material in the manuscript,² and printed in full the comparatively small portion of this material to be found in the Antwerp leaves, together with a linguistic commentary. He rejected the connexion with both Abbot Aelfric and Archbishop Aelfric, though admitting that the *Vocabulary* was dependent on Aelfric's *Glossary*.³ In dealing with the history of the manuscript, he noted the importance of the catalogues of 1592 and 1650 as evidence that the manuscript had always belonged to the Plantin-Moretus collection, and suggested giving up the name 'Rubens' in its description.⁴ His article was misleading in two points, however. Having been unable to obtain a copy of Vanderhaeghen's work, and accepting the story of the All Souls refugees on the authority of Stein, he made the suggestion that the manuscript of the *Excerptiones* might be of this origin.⁵ More seriously, perhaps, he had obviously not looked at the introduction to Somner's dictionary, and was thus led to assume that it was the painter and not his son who had communicated the manuscript to Junius. This led him to place the date of the transcription before Rubens's death in 1640 instead of after it.⁶

One might have hoped that, these two misconceptions apart, Förster's article would finally have put an end to the confusion so long surrounding the *Vocabulary*; but while Wright-Wülcker and Bosworth-Toller continue to be in general use there is little likelihood that this will be the case. Thus, even Professor Robert T. Meyer's recent admirable study of 'Isidorian "Glossae Collectae" in Aelfric's Vocabulary' refers to *Archbishop Aelfric's Vocabulary*, though the author himself tells us that this is the glossary

¹ *Anglia*, xli (1917), 94-161.

² He dates the alphabetical glossary to the beginning of the 11th century (p. 99), and the class-glossary (pp. 102 f.), like the interlinear glosses (p. 99) and the final glossary (p. 152), to the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century, though Ker refers all these items to the first half of the 11th century. Förster considered the letter to 'Ælf.' to be in the same hand as the class-glossary (p. 153); it refers to Cnut, of course, but need not be a contemporary copy.

³ P. 94, n. 2.

⁴ Pp. 156 f. He acutely conjectured that Junius might have come into contact with Rubens through his book *De pictura veterum*, though apparently unaware of Rubens's letter on the subject.

⁵ P. 155, cf. n. 1; pp. 157 f.

⁶ Pp. 156 f. Other important points from Förster's article are his rejection of the connexion (maintained by Zupitza) between the *Excerptiones* and Aelfric's *Grammar* (p. 98, n. 1), and his collection of references to Junius's methods as a copyist (p. 95, n. 4; but the article in *Academy*, xxxviii (1890), 274, to which he refers is not anonymous; it is signed 'H. Logeman').

which is found in eight (it should be 'seven') manuscripts of the *Grammar*.¹ Professor Meyer, it may be remarked, deserves considerable credit for identifying 'batches' of glosses in the text in its present disordered condition;² but further work on the sources of the *Vocabulary* must surely await a fresh edition of the complete text, in which the various glossary elements are carefully distinguished, and the words printed in their original forms and, just as important, their original order.

¹ *Traditio*, xii (1956), 398, n. 1; cf. p. 404.

² See also Meritt, *Fact and Lore*, pp. 197 ff.

THE POEMS OF NICHOLAS HARE

By JOHN CAREY

ANYONE who has worked on manuscript poetry of the early seventeenth century will know how poems and groups of poems to which no author's name can be ascribed tend to crop up, in various places, again and again. This perpetual anonymity is always rather irritating. Something may be said, then, for attempting to gather together a number of these waifs and strays and to attribute them to an author. By doing this in the present case we retrieve from apparently complete oblivion a member—admittedly a humble one—of that brilliant Inns-of-Court literary set to which Donne and Campion, Marston and Guilpin, Beaumont and Benjamin Rudyerd and John Davies all belonged.

Our starting-point is the volume entitled *Certain Elegies done by Sundrie Excellent Wits. With Satyres and Epigrams*, which was printed by B. Alsop for Miles Partriche in 1618, and in which the satires and epigrams are the work of Henry FitzGeffrey of Lincoln's Inn. Of the elegies, two are by Drayton, one by Beaumont, and one, which begins 'Whether these Honours, or else Love, it be',¹ is headed *An Elegie by N. H.* Bullen, in his article on Henry FitzGeffrey in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, suggests Nathaniel Hooke as the author of this poem. He apparently took the name from Utterson's facsimile reprint (Beldornie Press, 1843) of the 1620 edition of *Certain Elegies*, to which he refers. Utterson speaks there of 'N. H. whom the late Mr. Park conjectured to be Nathaniel Hookes'. There is, however, no trace of a Nathaniel Hooke or Hookes in the early seventeenth century, and it seems very likely that this conjecture was originally the result of confusion with Nicholas Hookes, author of *Amanda, a Sacrifice to an Unknown Goddess . . . By N.H. of Trinity Colledge in Cambridge*, which was published in 1653. That such confusion has arisen is indicated by two facts. Hazlitt gives the author of *Amanda* as Nathaniel Hookes, instead of Nicholas, and, like Utterson, gives Nathaniel Hookes as the author of the disputed poem in *Certain Elegies*;² and the British Museum Catalogue actually lists this volume under the name of Nathaniel Hookes (later corrected to Nicholas Hookes), the author of *Amanda*. In fact Nicholas Hookes was not born until 1628, ten years after the poem thus attributed to him was printed. Both Hazlitt and Bullen have likewise followed Utterson in dating the first edition of *Certain Elegies* 1617, instead

¹ See Poem 1, below.

² *Hand-Book to the Popular, Poetical and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain* (London, 1867), pp. 200 and 282.

of 1618. The volume which appeared in 1617 was entitled *Satyres and Satyricall Epigrams. With Certaine Obseruations at Black Fryers. By H:[enry] F:[itz-Geffrey] of Lincolnes-Inne Gent:*, and was printed not by Alsop but by Edward Alde. The elegies were not added to this volume until the following year, when the 1617 title-page was torn away, and the eight leaves of elegies, with a new title-page, bound on to the front.¹

It is necessary, then, to produce a new candidate for the authorship of *An Elegie by N.H.*, and such a candidate can be found by following a short trail of manuscript evidence. In B.M. MS. Add. 25707, f. 32^r, the letters N. H. appear beneath a poem (repeated without ascription at f. 177^r), clearly in the same manner as the *Elegie*, and beginning 'Yf each ones fault weare in theare forheads wrytt'.² This poem appears again, with the same ascription, in University of Edinburgh MS. Laing III, 493, f. 111^r, and the letters N. H. are found also beneath poems on ff. 89^r, 91^v, and 99^r, which begin, respectively, 'I had no being till I saw her eies', 'When by the carelesse I deuisinge sitt', and 'Heere doe repose but in lamented waste'.³ This last poem, an epitaph of six lines on a young woman, is found in several other early seventeenth-century manuscripts,⁴ among them Bodleian MS. Ashmole 38 (Poem No. 278), where, too, it is subscribed N. H. In the Hazlewood-Kingsborough MS. in the Huntington Library⁵ each one of the N. H. poems mentioned so far appears. 'If each mans fault', headed *Epigrame*, at f. 99^r, is followed immediately by 'I had no being', and by 'When by thee careles' headed *Sonnett*; 'Here do repose' is at f. 113^v, followed, significantly, by Jonson's epitaph on Cecilia Boulstred; 'Whether these honours', the poem in the FitzGeffrey volume, is at f. 106^r, headed *Elegie*. Two leaves earlier, at f. 104^r, and also headed *Elegie*, is a poem beginning 'Not in the dust wee tread, but mounted high'. In common with the other poems mentioned from the Kingsborough MS., this poem has no ascription. It does, however, appear in B.M. MS. Egerton 923, f. 18^r, where it is subscribed *N. Hare*, and is immediately preceded by the poem 'I had noe being' which, as we have seen, is ascribed to 'N. H.' in MS. Laing III, 493.

There is no N. Hare recorded at Oxford in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries, nor at Gray's Inn, the Middle Temple, or Lincoln's Inn. A Nicholas Hare matriculated Fellow Commoner from Christ's in 1598-9, and Venn⁶ thinks it probable that he is to be identified with

¹ Thus the signatures of the 1618 volume run: A⁸; A (repeated)⁸ (first 2 lacking); B-G⁸ (last 2, probably blank, lacking).

² See Poem II, below.

³ See Poems III, IV, and V.

⁴ e.g. O'Flaherty MS., Harvard, p. 171; Luttrell MS., in the library of Sir Geoffrey Keynes, f. 50^v; Bridgewater MS., Huntington Library, f. 26^v.

⁵ MS. HM. 198, part II.

⁶ *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, part I, ii. 305.

Nicholas, the son and heir of John Hare, Master of the Bench of the Inner Temple. The Inner Temple Register¹ records the fact that this Nicholas Hare, who was admitted in June 1596, died in 1622 'Nondum Quadragenarius'. Peile² supports the identification, remarking that 'such premature admissions of sons of Benchers are common'.

Nicholas's father, John³ (1546–1613), Clerk of the Court of Wards and Liveries, was the eighth son of John Hare, mercer of London, who inherited the very considerable estates⁴ of his brother Sir Nicholas, Master of the Rolls under Mary. John the younger entered the Inner Temple in 1571, was called to the bench in 1591, became Treasurer in 1605, and sat as M.P. for Horsham in 1587. He had houses in Fleet Street and at Totteridge, Hertfordshire. He was married twice; first, on 8 November 1574, to Lucy Barley, one of the three daughters of Francis Barley of Bibbesworth Hall, Hertfordshire.⁵ By her he had a daughter, Elizabeth, who died young, and a son, Nicholas, the subject of this inquiry.

Nicholas was baptized at his father's house in Blackfriars on 20 November 1582. I have not been able to discover where he was at school. While he was still at Cambridge his mother died,⁶ and his father was soon afterwards remarried to Margaret, daughter of John Crouch, Esq., and widow of Adam Elvine of London. By her he had a son, Hugh, who in 1625 was made Lord Coleraine in the peerage of Ireland. Nicholas's career at Cambridge probably ended in 1602, or perhaps earlier. At any rate John Manningham recalls in his diary how, on 31 March 1603, he 'was in m^r Nich: Hares companie, at the King's head. a gallant yong gent, like to be heir to much land. he is of a sweet behauior: a good spirit and a pleasing witty discourse'.⁷ On the same page in his diary Manningham recounts two snippets from Hare's conversation:

A wench complained that she was rauished in a chamber and being asked how chance shee cryed not. why there were some in the next roome said shee, and they would haue heard mee; an other said shee could not cry for laughing. Mr: Hare

¹ Cooke, *Students Admitted to the Inner Temple, 1547–1660* (London, 1877).

² *Biographical Register of Christ's College* (Cambridge, 1910), i. 230.

³ The information about the Hare family contained in the following paragraphs is drawn from: Clutterbuck, *History of the County of Hertford* (London, 1815–27), iii. 429; D.N.B. (article on Hugh Hare, First Lord Coleraine); B.M. MSS. Add. 5524, f. 69; Add. 38257, ff. 165–6; Sloane 1429, f. 50^v; Bodleian MS. Eng. misc. c. 20, vol. i, f. 98.

⁴ At his death Sir Nicholas held the lands of Marham and Strumpshaw, Norfolk; Tottenham, Hertfordshire; and Bruisyard and Westhall, Suffolk.

⁵ The details of John Hare's marriage, and of the birth of his daughter and elder son, are recorded in his own hand in Bodleian MS. Eng. misc. c. 20, vol. i, f. 105.

⁶ 29 October 1601. The inscription on her funeral monument is given by Hatton in *A New View of London* (1708), ii. 273.

⁷ B.M. MS. Harley 5353, f. 118^r.

. . . a gents nose fell a bleding verry late in a night and soe causing his boy to light him downe to a pumpe to washe the bloud away: he spied written upon the pump, that it was built at the proper cost and charges of a phisicion which lay nere the place, whom he presently sent for to come to a lady that was dangerously sickle but when he came, he shewed that his nose was bloudy, that he went downe to haue washt at the pumpe, but espying it to be built at his proper costs and charges, he thought good manners to aske leave of him before he woulde washe it Mr N: Hare.

We might guess from this that Nicholas was a young man with a taste for poetry, as the first of these anecdotes is a prose version of one of Campion's Latin epigrams, published in his *Poemata* of 1595.¹

In September 1604 Nicholas entered into partnership with his father as Clerk of the Court of Wards and Liveries.² By 1610, however, he seems to have grown tired of this highly respectable and lucrative employment, and in the spring of that year he obtained a licence 'to travell into the parts beyond the seas for three years . . . with seruaunt Naggs or gueldings and Fifty pounds in money'.³ The following summer Dudley Carleton mentions to Sir Thomas Edmondes that Hare is at Venice, bound for Constantinople with a Mr. Bowes,⁴ and a year later he is reported to be on his way to Malta via Cyprus, having just returned from a trip to Jerusalem with the same Mr. Bowes and a Mr. Willoughby, whom he intends to rejoin in Naples for the winter.⁵ The journey had not been without its hazards. Carleton remarks that 'of seven Dutch gentlemen that made the journey with them, and came back as far as Cyprus, three they buried in that island, and flung the other three overboard between that place and this'.⁶ Nicholas was with Carleton again at Venice in June the following year, when his father died in London. It is pretty clear that John Hare did not feel particularly pleased about his elder son's desire to see the world. Chamberlain, that arch-gossip, hears it rumoured that he 'left his sonne there with you [i.e. with Carleton in Venice] but 300 li. a yeare and his office whereof he had the reversion: but with the limitation that he live in England'.⁷ Chamberlain's informant was mistaken about the £300 p.a. legacy. In his will⁸ John left the bulk of his property to his second wife and to 'her little son and mine Hugh Hare'. To Nicholas he bequeathed

¹ Campion, *Works*, ed. Vivian (Oxford, 1909), p. 341.

² 24 September 1604. See *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1603-10, p. 152.

³ P.R.O., *Signet Office Docquets*, March 1608-October 1610. The licence was granted on 10 April.

⁴ B.M. MS. Stowe 172, f. 150^r; letter dated 6 August 1611.

⁵ B.M. MS. Stowe 173, f. 47^r; Carleton to Edmondes, 3 August 1612.

⁶ Carleton to Chamberlain, 12 August 1612, in *The Court and Times of James the First* (London, 1848), i. 195.

⁷ Chamberlain to Carleton, 10 June 1613: *Letters*, ed. McClure (Philadelphia, 1939), i. 457. ⁸ P.C.C. 66, Capel.

only his office as Clerk of the Court of Wards. Apparently he had not much confidence in his son's administrative abilities, as he appoints 'my neiphue H. Audely and my honest clerk and friend Richard Chamberlayne' to assist Nicholas 'in the due ordering and executing of matters in the office' and charges his son 'to be ruled therin by them'. Nicholas does not seem to have been in any hurry to return home. At any rate, he was still abroad in October, though he had by that time sent a letter via Chamberlain to Sir Walter Cope, who had been made Master of the Wards four months previously, and who was therefore understandably anxious that his Clerk of the Court 'should make homeward with all his best conveniencie'.¹ It is worth remembering that the young Thomas Carew joined Carleton as his secretary in the autumn of 1613, and that Inigo Jones was at Venice earlier in the year, in the retinue of the Earl of Arundel.² Perhaps it was the company of men of this sort that made Nicholas unwilling to leave Italy. In fact he clearly relinquished his tenure of the clerkship for a time, since in June 1618 he is once again granted life tenure of 'the office of Clarke of the Court of Wards and Liueries', along with one 'Robert Brooke gent.', 'with the yerly fee of 10*l*s'.³ By February of the next year Nicholas was the sole clerk: Sir Stephen Le Sieur demands somewhat querulously why this is so, and why he should not himself be granted the second clerkship in return for his thirty years of service as an ambassador. Viscount Wallingford, Chief Justice Hobart, and Sir James Ley, who were requested by the King to adjudicate, decided that Hare should remain the sole clerk.⁴ A year later, in the spring of 1620, Nicholas's uncle Hugh, 'an old, rich man of the Temple',⁵ died. Perhaps he had discovered that his nephew was the author of the flippantly immoral poem in the *FitzGeffrey* volume. Very likely he disapproved of Nicholas for other reasons as well. What is certain is that he left half of his huge estate to Sir John Hare of Norfolk, the elder son of his nephew, Sir Ralph, and half to Hugh, Nicholas's younger brother. There is no mention of Nicholas in his will at all, but his brother is described somewhat pointedly as 'a dutiful good child'.⁶ Since Chamberlain's estimate of the value of the elder Hugh Hare's estate is as high as £80,000,⁷ it is not hard to account for the note of rueful self-righteousness in Nicholas's own will, when he bequeathes 'to my louing brother Hugh Hare Esquier one bason and ewer of silver fashioned like a great scallopp shell, the Eawer a mermaide desiring God Almighty that

¹ Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 October 1613: McClure, i. 478.

² See Carew's *Poems*, ed. Dunlap (Oxford, 1949), p. xix.

³ P.R.O., *Signet Office Docquets, March 1608–October 1620*.

⁴ C.S.P. Dom., 1611–18, p. 520.

⁵ Chamberlain to Carleton, 11 March 1620: McClure, ii. 293. The date of Hugh's death is given as 4 February in Bodleian MS. Eng. misc. c. 20, vol. i, f. 98.

⁶ See his will: P.C.C. 24, Soame.

⁷ McClure, ii. 293.

as he hath given him a large and plentiful worldly estate so likewise he would giue him as full a proporcion and measure of grace that wee may once meeite in the kingdome of heauen together I being ready to leauue this world willingly which I haue long bene weary of'. This assertively anti-materialist attitude is similar to the one Nicholas adopts in his finest poem—finest by virtue of the cool, clear upper air to which its opening soars:

Not in the dust wee tread, but mounted high
Flyes with calme wings the great felicitie.

Probably this poem was his last: already he is aware of approaching death:

My meditation warninge me on high
Teaches me this short lif's calamity.

In the will, made on 18 December 1621, he says that he is now 'weake in body'.¹ Later Carleton was to tell Chamberlain that, in his opinion, it was a good thing that Nicholas ('that unfortunat gentleman') had, at this time, 'so honest a friend as Captain Harvey about him; otherwise his hypochondriacal humours might have carried him some such way as the Lord of Berkshire is gone, and as our strange bishop is going through ambition and avarice. . .'.² This certainly does not say much for Nicholas's state of mind: the Earl of Berkshire referred to had recently shot himself with a crossbow, and 'our strange bishop', the Archbishop of Spalato, had, as Carleton's secretary, Locke, had just reported from London,³ committed what some might have considered an even greater misdemeanour by preaching 'a sermon at Mercers' Chapel, wherein he seemed to be well inclined towards the Roman Church'.

Shortly after his uncle's death, Nicholas's step-mother, 'a sober comly woman and of great meanes',⁴ continued her ascent of the social ladder by marrying Sir Henry Montague, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, who was later to become Earl of Manchester. By the end of the next year Nicholas was on his death-bed. He died on 13 January 1622. His friend, John Harvey, writing to Sir Dudley Carleton a few weeks later, fears that

it would perhaps be greatly displeasing to your Lordship that loued him so well, to reade a long relation of his grieuous languishing disease, it beeing the coughe of the lungs; this only may then suffice to asswage the sorrowe of his true frends, that he endurd his great and sharp affliction with exceeding much patience often comforting and strengthning himself with reading the story of Jobb, hee was earnestly sollicited by som of his ancient acquaintances to haue admitted of Romish priests to conferr with him, but hee resolued them that hee wold die in that religion in which hee was bredd and borne, the friday after Christmas

¹ P.C.C. 1, Savile.

² *Court and Times of James the First*, ii. 298.

³ Ibid., ii. 289. Locke's letter is dated 4 February 1621/2.

⁴ Chamberlain to Carleton, 29 April 1620; McClure, ii. 302.

day hee receiued communion with Doctor Baytes Parson of Saint Clemmens church and died the sonday morning next after twelfe day hauing perfect memorie and speech untill the last half howre of his ende.¹

As for his will, the most arresting thing about it is the signature of the second witness: 'Isaack Walton'. The bequests, for the most part, are fairly humdrum—small sums to godchildren, legal colleagues, and servants, and one to the fashionable 'Mr Perryall the Phisicion dwellinge at Bowe in Essex', who had presumably attended him in his illness. He leaves also 'tweo hundred pounds of lawfull money of England to be employed as a stock' for the benefit of the poor of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, and specifies that distributions of the profit arising from this stock shall be the concern of 'the deane of Pawles'. It is pleasant to think of Donne, who had become Dean about six weeks before, supervising the distribution of 'three shillings and fower pence in bread' each week, and 'the surplusage of the proffitt yearly arising of the said stock . . . in coales' once a year 'on St. Thomas Eve'. Nicholas also bequeathed 'a ring of gould sett with nyne dyamonds which I usually weare' to 'my lovinge friend Jane Brogden the wife of Stephen Brogden' and, as an afterthought, to a fellow poetaster, 'Sr Thomas Nevill knightz² my Italian cabinett of Ebanie with many thanks for his love'. The residue is left to 'my true freind John Harvie, brother of Symon Harvie', who is made sole executor. Not much is known about 'Captain' John Harvey, as Carleton and Chamberlain style him. His father, John Harvey of Ickworth, had at least seven children, probably more, of whom John was the third, and died penniless in 1630, in spite of the fact that his wife, Frances Bockinge, had brought him a share in the Bockinge estates.³ Captain John was with Sir Thomas Glover at Naples in 1612, so perhaps it was in Italy that Nicholas met him; Sir Thomas Edmondes had known him earlier in Brussels.⁴ By 1618 he is at The Hague, begging money from Carleton, with the intention of going to Guiana or the West Indies, or so Chamberlain conjectures.⁵ For his own part Chamberlain thinks him 'somewhat chollerick and impatient'. At least he was grateful enough for the 'three or fowre thousand pound'⁶ which Nicholas left him to wish to perpetuate his friend's memory. Apparently Carleton had a portrait of Nicholas, painted, presumably, while they were in Italy together. As far as Harvey knows it is the only one available,⁷ so he approaches Chamberlain to get him to write to Carleton, asking if a copy may be made 'by

¹ P.R.O., S.P. 14/127, f. 68^r; letter dated 4 February 1621/2.

² Son of Edward, Lord Abergavenny: made a Knight of the Bath, 3 November 1616. He died in 1628. Shirley has an epitaph for him in his *Poems*, 1646. One of his own poems appears in Poet. MS. 420127. 1 in the Folger Shakespeare Library, at f. 19^r.

³ See *A Dictionary of Hervey's* (Ipswich, 1927), iii. 378, v. 81.

⁴ MS. Stowe 173, f. 177^r.

⁵ McClure, ii. 130.

⁶ Ibid. ii. 422.

⁷ See his letter to Carleton, S.P. 14/127, f. 68^r.

Michaell Jansen or some other goode hand', and also writes a fulsome letter to Carleton himself to the same end, announcing his intention to 'place a poore monument in remembrance' of Hare in St. Dunstan's-in-the-West where 'his boddy according to his owne commaund was buried'. In his reply to Chamberlain¹ Sir Dudley says that he has instructed his secretary in England, Thomas Locke, to let Captain Harvey take the picture to Ickworth, his father's house, and copy it 'by what hand he likes best there'.

Nicholas's monument did not survive the rebuilding of St. Dunstan's in 1832, but Seymour² has preserved its inscription, and reports that the monument itself was a 'very fair' one:

M. S. Nicholai Hare

Viri morum suavitate & elegantia, animi candore & magnitudine, ingenii denique Acumine & judicij gravitate, Incomparabilis; Disciplinarum & Lin-
guarum, tam quæ ad Artes, quam quæ ad Aulas spectant, cognitione ornatissimi.
Cuius Egregias & Raras Animi dotes, Anglia, Belgia, Gallia, ipsaque Italia
iamdudum suspexere & stupuere. Qui desiderio sui apud amicos, omnesque
bonos relictio, obiit, Eheu! nondum quadragenarius, Anno M.DC.XXI.

Johannes Harvey, Amico dulcissimo & B.M. in perpetuam grati animi
memoriam P. Magnificentius positurus, si ei suam ipsius pietatem magis quam
amici voluntatem exequi licuisset.

Vale, anima candidissima, vale, tuorum quos dolore & luctu conficis Æternum
desiderium, vale, Patriæ & seculi summum ornamentum.

Even after allowing for funerary hyperbole we are fairly safe in assuming from this that Nicholas was well known among his contemporaries as a man of letters, and that he had been accepted into literary and learned circles on the Continent. He died too early for his name to endure. Eleven years were still to pass before the publication of Donne's poems set the example for the gentlemen-poets of the early 1600's to go to press. As his poems were copied and recopied, along with hundreds of others, in the years immediately after his death, his name or initials would soon come to mean nothing to the copyists, and would be omitted and forgotten. *Certain Elegies*, which appeared on the London bookstalls about the time Nicholas reassumed his post as Clerk of the Court of Wards, affixed his initials to Poem I, below. The next four bear his initials in one or more early seventeenth-century manuscripts, and the sixth is ascribed to him by name in Egerton MS. 923. The other three³ appear among his poems in the Hazlewood-Kingsborough manuscript. They are so similar, both in style

¹ *Court and Times of James the First*, ii. 298.

² *Survey of London and Westminster* (1734), i. 773.

³ In the Hazlewood-Kingsborough MS., Poem VII is at ff. 100^r-101^r, preceded by Poem III, and followed by the first seventeen lines of Poem VIII, which are immediately followed by Poem IX. The first seventeen lines of Poem VIII are repeated, along with the remainder of the poem, at f. 105^r-v, immediately after Poem VI and immediately before Poem I.

and manner, to the acknowledged 'N.H.' poems that they clearly deserve to be included here. It is true that they are not ascribed to Hare, but none of his poems in the Hazlewood-Kingsborough MS. bears any ascription. The first of these unascribed poems, 'Lett natures fooles, made out of sullen earth', is found also in B.M. MSS. Add. 25707, f. 164^v, and Stowe 962, f. 139^v. The second, 'Why with unkindest swiftnes doest thou turne', was printed in 1660 in the *Poems* of William, Earl of Pembroke, and Sir Benjamin Rudyerd. John Donne, junior, who edited this volume, included in it a good many poems by other writers, among them Raleigh, Dyer, Strode, and Carew, and distinguished the poems which were in fact by Pembroke or Rudyerd by the initials 'P' or 'R'. 'Why with unkindest swiftnes' bears neither initial. The text of the poem which Donne reproduced lacks lines 10–12 of the Hazlewood-Kingsborough version. The third unascribed poem, 'Thinke not on Jealousie or domestique warr', appears, as far as I know, only in this manuscript.

Clearly the most authoritative text for Poems II–VI, and for IX, is supplied by the Hazlewood-Kingsborough MS., which has accordingly been used as the copy text for these. For Poem VII the copy text has been taken from MS. Add. 25707. Departures have been made from the copy text only where one of the other manuscripts provides an unquestionably preferable reading, and all such departures have been recorded in the critical apparatus, as have all other alternative readings, except those which are obviously mere blunders on the part of the copyist. Variant spellings have not been recorded, nor have additions of punctuation and capitalization which have been made throughout.

The following abbreviations are used:

A25	B.M. MS. Add. 25707.	H	Huntington Library MS. HM 198. ¹
A25 (b)	B.M. MS. Add. 25707, f. 177 ^r .	L	Univ. of Edinburgh MS. Laing III, 493.
Ash38	Bodleian MS. Ashmole 38.	P	<i>Poems</i> , Pembroke and Rudyerd, 1660.
C	<i>Certain Elegies, &c.</i> , 1618.		
Eg	B.M. MS. Egerton 923.	S	B.M. MS. Stowe 962.

I

Elegy

Whether theis Honours, or else Loue, it be...

[This poem will be found in *Certain Elegies, &c.* (1618), sig. A6^r. The text in H seems superior in the following cases:

1 theis H: those C	2 thee H: me C	26 theis H: those C	33 with H: a C
47 For H: So C	53 inaudacitie H: inundacitie C	57 shall H: with C	63 Slepes H: Sleepie C]

¹ I am indebted to Miss Helen Gardner, from whom I first learnt of the presence of these poems in the Hazlewood-Kingsborough MS., and to the trustees of the Huntington Library, for permitting me to print texts from that manuscript and for supplying me with photostats.

II

Epigrame

If each mans fault weare in his forehead writt,
 Lines only would be read, and books reiected;
 Nor hatt, nor hood, nor crowne would easie sitt,
 And lowest foreheads would be most affected;
 The holy hermite would be apprehended
 In crimes unthought of till we read them there,
 Reputed virgins would, thirteene once ended,
 In colour full of guiltinesse appeare;
 Nor I my selfe, that should my selfe knowe best,
 Nor thou, deare Mistress, should be then exempted;
 We should be both in manie tongues profest,
 Thou for thie yeildinge, I for hauinge tempted:
 Bee not discourag'd, I no reason see
 Thou should'st for my sake any fault avowe;
 Let mee stand censurd, and thou censure free,
 Thy faults be written in thie husbands browe.

H, L, A25, A25(b) Epigrame] No title *L, A25, A25(b)* 1 mans fault] ones fault *A25*
ones faultes A25(b) 2 in] on *A25(b)* 3 his forehead] theare foreheads *A25,*
theare foreheade A25(b) 4 and books] the rest *A25, A25(b)* 5 hatt] hatts *A25*
nor hood, nor crowne] nor bonnets then *A25* 6 nor Bonnett then *A25(b)* 7 affected]
respected A25, A25(b) 8 In] Of *A25, A25(b)* 9 we] you *A25, A25(b)* 10 would
A25, A25(b): there H 11 then *L* 12 colour] cutters *A25* 13 omitted *A25, A25(b)*
A25(b) 14 both in] both on *A25* 15 then on *A25(b)* 16 omitted *A25, A25(b)*
14 Thou should'st for my sake any] But why should'st thou for mee one *A25, A25(b)*
15 omitted A25, A25(b) 16 faults be] falte bee *L* faults are *A25, A25(b)* in] on *L*

III

I had no being till I saw her eies,
 Yes, such a beinge as to life prepares,
 Since in beinge happie onlie life relies
 And not in breathinge, which dull creatures shares;
 When from her eyes a secrette vertue fledd
 Armd with all power to worke upon the bloud
 And passinge ore my earthlie shadow said
 'Let it be life'; life was, and it was good.
 This vertue lost she? no, it sallyed forth,
 For many liues before had she created
 And many shall, in seruice of whose worth
 Mine, while it lasts, shall from her eyes be dated;
 This onlie makes my hopes and feares run euen,
 She is to great to take what she hath giuen.

H, L, Eg 1 eies *L, Eg: face H* 2 Yes such a] Onely such *L* Yes I had *Eg*
as] which Eg 6 the] my *L* 7 ore *L, Eg: ouer H* 9 lost she? no] loste not
shee that L lost she not yt *Eg* 13 hopes and feares] feares and hopes *Eg*

IV

Sonnett

When by thee careles I deuisinge sitt,
 And, to deceave the summer howers, mainetaine
 Many an idle purpose with my witt,
 Perhaps, for want of other talke, I faine
 A longinge for a kisse, no deadly sinne,
 To which thou dost consent as soone as I
 And when I leaue art readie to beginne,—
 Soe plentifull in honest libertye:
 But when from thence I higher would aspire,
 (Or rather would descend, as change desiringe),
 Thou art as could as I am full of fier
 And leauest me there vpon my passions tyreing:
 As thou giuest appetite, giue it meanes to wast,
 And be not free at all, or be less chaste.

H, L Sonnett] No title L 7 art] ar L 12 tyreing L: trieing H

V

Here do repose, but in lamented waste,
 And figure out the sisters needless hast
 Those limbs, which, had heauen timelie glorified
 Butt like the spiritt they owed, had neuer died;
 Here lies the least of her whose noblest parts
 Obtaine a tombe within our broken harts.

H, L, Ash38 2 And] To Ash38 4 they owed] shee owed L thay own'd
 Ash38 5 nobler L 6 Obtaine] Enioye L Obtaynd Ash38

VI

Not in the dust wee tread, but mounted high
 Flyes with calme wings the great felicitie;
 We seeke a graue with paine and doe enquire
 Only for earth which we are sure to inheire,
 Meanwhile, while theis meane things are most enyoyd,
 The noblest part of us is vnmployd,
 (Att least in the extreame good), and, most assured,
 But sleeps within us and is vnmanured.
 My meditation warninge me on high
 Teaches me this short lif's calamity,
 Which when I sadly weigh, I doe beginne
 To wonder how we dote so on our Inne,—

H, Eg 5 theis] the Eg 6 vnmployd] least imploid Eg 7-8 omitted Eg
 10 short lif's] liues short Eg

This house of clay, this corruptible dust,
 The fee of death, and giuen vs but in trust,—
 Yet makinge loue to life, (as most menn doe
 Theire only Time so recklessly forslowe),
 As if death were not, or our slender twine
 Were large as is the geometrike line.
 Our course is swift as lightninge seene and fiedd,
 And what of life is past is already dead.
 How serious and mortall theire designes
 Are for discouerie of hidden mines,
 Or to drieue trafique with remoued lands;
 Although the clime their health and ease withstands,
 They shake off danger and in hope of gaine
 They do diminish feare and lessen paine;
 Yet when theis welthy wonders they request
 Are come to hand, and they of much possest,
 They aske for more, their hopes untermind ly,
 And neuer end before the wishers dye:
 Which done, their memorie is sodaine ould,
 And they, (in the forgotten dust enrould)
 Neuer lift vp their names to after times
 As they who formerly reioyced in Rimes
 And, trustinge all their fame with it, doe liue
 With life such as eternity cann giue.
 Now I contemne the sand and seeme to flye
 Aboue the brest of the disturbed skye,
 From whence I viewe the vanitie of man
 That heaps vp cares vpon this earthlie span,
 And with laborious anguish weares his powers
 In sad fore-thinkinge, that the winged howers
 Lament their passinge and with mourninge fly
 To be bestowed away so heauilye:
 Poore hopes, that ay me but att a point of sand,
 When earth it selfe, if it compared stand
 With the vast world, is but the weary lees
 And foote of this great creature. I despise
 To sett my heart on ought that suffers change;
 I thanke my starrs that soe my thoughts arrange.
 All things doe suffer a variety
 That vnder Nature are laid out to die;
 The simple bodyes this exchange outlive
 And of themselues new being doe deriuie;

16 recklessly forslowe] wretchedly bestowe Eg 24 the Eg: they H 25 gaine
 Eg: gaines H 27 theis] those Eg 30 before] until Eg 31-38 omitted Eg
 43 passinge] passage Eg 46 When Eg: Where H 48 foote] foole Eg great
 same Eg 50 I] And Eg 53 The simple bodys Eg: This simple bodie H

The sands resolued to water turned are,
The streaminge water changes into aire,
The aire attenuate becommeth fire
Which, of the fower, is lifted to aspire;
So mutuall alteringe they doe sustaine
For of the last the first is made againe.
Fortune and Time do large dominion share
In this our sublunary theater,
And all things wherevnto theire powers extend
Timely or late ariue vpon theire end;
Only the gentle Muse, of Time is friended,
Whose glory, well begun, is neuer ended,
And, though eclipsed, does no death sustaine
But to the open light aspires again;
Of all lowe things which Time and Change depraue
Only devyner verses fly the Graue.

63 things Eg: this H powers Eg: power H 67 no] not Eg

VII

To his Mistress: the Usurye of Time.

Lett natures fooles, made out of sullen earth,
Dissolve againe after a weeping birth,
Wastinge their course in vertuous miserye,
Pursueinge grieve before their time to dye.
Labor is endlesse, vertue vnregarded,
And best deserte with base suspition guarded;
Lett me leade out my howers in privatye,
Not knoweinge death till nature calls to die:
(When quiett silence shall enwombe mee rounde,
Sleepinge in earth untill the latest sounde,
What tyme, approuinge the faire light againe,
Caesar and I shall rise as equall menn).
Wee are no learners in this arte, for wee
Knowe what life is, and her varietye;
Wee knowe that Mistress and her sodaine wheele,
The hasty winged wee not by the heele
But by the forehead hould, the howres runn on,
And wee cann vse them were they tenn for one;
For proffe of this our cunninge vsurye,
My dearest hope, lett mee beginne with thee:

*A25, S, H To his Mistress: the Usurye of Time] Eligie H 1 out of S, H: of
A25 2 Dissolute] Resolute H 3 course] hours H 4 vertuous] a vertuouse S
6 base] strict H 7 privatye] privacy S, H 8 calls] call H 13 no S, H
nowe A25 20 hope] hopes H*

5 gaine
ttened Eg
great]
H

Giue me a kisse from those faire lipps of thyne,
 And make it double by enioyinge myne,
 Another yett, nay yett, and yett another,
 And lett the first kisse bee the seconds mother;
 Pleasure hath merelye noe satietye,
 Nor in this kind cann it bee sad to dye; 25
 Giue mee a thousand kisses, and yett more,
 And then repeate those that haue paste before,
 Lett us beginne when daye light springes in heauen,
 And kisse till light descende into the euen,
 And when that modest secretarye, night, 30
 Discoulors all saue thie heauen-beaminge white,
 We will beginne reuels of hidden loue
 In that deare orbe where silent pleasures moue;
 And when the skye leaues off by course to mourne,
 Wee'l rest and languishe till the night retурне, 35
 Which wee will ofte reclaime, and ofte intreat,
 To warne the starrye senate to their seate,
 Under whose regiment noe eye shall see
 The secret dallyance twixt thee and mee,
 Whilst in newe straines of frailtye and delight 40
 Wee vent the dull howers of the sullen night,
 Which is euen eniuious of the ioyes shee couers
 In the sweet mutuall suffering of lovers.
 Thou that as equall with the daye wert made,
 Foulde upp the worlde in an eternal shade, 45
 Smother the beautye of each livinge thinge
 Vnder the gloomy shadowe of thy winge;
 For were the day noe more to visitt us,
 O then for ever I shoulde hould her thus
 Naked, encayned, emptye of idle feare, 50
 As the first lovers in the garden were;
 I should a while bee seuered from the earth,
 And enter ioyes not promis'd in my birth,
 Amidst these thornye passages espyeinge
 The rose of life before the hower of dyinge, 55
 (Dyinge betwixt her breasts which are soe whyte
 That to dye there would doe a man delight),
 And from her balmy breath receave suplye
 That to my fainte powers giues new leauue to dye; 60

23 and yett] and then *S* 29 in] from *H* 30 light *H*: night *A25, S* [descende]
 descends *H* 31 that] the *S* 32 heauen-beaminge] heau'n brauininge *H*
 33 We will *S, H*: Will we *A25* 35 leaues off by course] by course leaues of *S, H*
 39 shall] cann *H* 43 euen *S, H*: omitted *A25* 44 sufferings] sufferinge *S*
 56 hower] day *H* 57 betwixt] betweene *H* which] that *H* 58 that] as *H*
 60 to my *H*: from my *A25, S* new] me *H*

Whilst shee my fate doth with her tongue controule,
 The powerfull engin to drawe up my soule.
 Mee thincks in this dead stillnesse of the night
 My sences labor with a strange delighte,
 More then the daye supplyes in her still reigne: 65
 My winged frailtye searcheth euerye vayne
 And vnreuealed passage of delight,
 Deliueringe wonders to my rauisht spright
 In liknes of her cheeks, and of her eyes
 Whose winningne sweetnes doth meethincks arise 70
 In heauenly circles, that obtaine no ende
 Whether to staye or they to motion tende;
 More faire in each degree then anye raye
 Knowne to the eveninge or uprisinge daye.
 Daye, doe not rise upon the starry hall, 75
 Foreslowe thy care, and lett the night swaye all,
 Whilst wee lye naked and secur'd from harms,
 Strictly enfoulded in each others arms.
 Embrace me still, for tyme runns on before,
 And beinge dead wee shall embrace noe more; 80
 Lett us kisse faster then the howers doe flye,
 Longe liue eache kisse and neuer knowe to dye,
 Yett if that fade and flye awaie to fast
 Impresse another and renewe the last;
 Lett vs vye kisses till our eye-lidds couer, 85
 And if I sleepe, thinke mee an idle louer,
 Or if I sleepe Ile still pursue the theame
 And eagerly Ile kisse thee in my dreame.
 But since each vanitye to a poynct doth tend,
 And our lascivious vigill must haue ende, 90
 When envious sleepe doth travell ore myne eyes
 And chardge with dreames my sceane of fantasyes,
 Uppon those honord alters of thy breast,
 Unto the peacefull minister of rest
 Ile doe a sleepye sacrifice, and there, 95
 Untill daye sprinckle our darke hemispheare,
 As one with wonder ravisht from my breath,
 In heuenlye stilnesse Ile resemble death;
 My youth and frailtye shall togeather dye,
 Tyme soe slept out is putt to vsurye. 100

ende] While *H* 62 drawel] waigh *H* 67 passage *S, H*: passages *A25*
 end] while *H* 62 drawel] waigh *H* 67 passage *S, H*: passages *A25*
 70 wynninge] runninge *H* 71 heauenly] heau'nly *H* 72 staye] state *H* tend] send *H*
 73 in each degree] by much degree *S, H* 76 care] race *H* 77 secur'd] secure *S, H* from] of *H* 79 me *H*: we *A25, S* 87 Or] And *H* the] that *H*
 88 my *H*: a *A25, S* 91 doth] does *H* 94 the] that *S, H* 97 As one *H*: Att
 once *A25, S* wonder] wonders *H* from *H*: with *A25, S*

VIII

Elegy

Why with unkindest swiftnes doest thou turne . . .

[This poem will be found in the *Poems* of Pembroke and Rudyerd, 1660, II sig. E4^v. The text in *H* seems superior in the following cases:

10-12 And spanned with greenest palizadoes round, | Wherleon the powers of night may
oft haue seene vs | And heard the contracts that haue binn betwene vs. *H*: omitted
63 nurst *H*: durst *P* 64 mischeifs doe secure *H*: wrongs can expiate *P* 74
leauings *H*: leauing *P*]

IX

Thinke not on jealousie or domestique warr,
Thou canst not well retire, engag'd so farr;
Thy hauinge heard me hath brought danger on
As much as wil be when thou art mine owne;
To great emprises while we are aspiringe,
To aduance is nobler danger then retiringe:
The wakinge ghost, thie husband, does not feare
The chance in any one particular,
Nor hath a doulfull thought of me, but when
He feares the vniuersall sonnes of men.
The worst is past, with wronge thou art suspected,
Deseruing which, thou shalt not be detected:
Wherto serue witt and art but to discouer
Thou dost not deale with an vnlearned louer?
Did euer any perish in my hand
Whom I haue seru'd with under Loue's command?
When, busily enquir'd, haue I by chaunce
Betraide a fauour,—or in countenance
Or, like great men with vanity ore-waigh'd,
Told things that should be done and not be said?
Haue I reioyced with importunitie
To winn me graces before publike eyes?
Thou never canst haue heard I did solicite
Att doubtfull houres with an vntimelie visite;
But, gouerning my passionate distresse,
Euer attended a secure accesse
Till mothers were asleepe, or husbands gone,
And powerfull waightinge women made my owne,
Whom to impawne to imortall secresy
In chaines of wished Venus I did ty,
And, though I loued them not, yet tooke the paine
To enforce belief, their silence to obtaine;
So that my whole attempts, saue one, haue thriud,
And no miscaryinge euer yet arived:

H 7 does] do *H*

The powers of loue haue so auspicious binn,
By whose addresse I shall thy fauors winne. 35
 Why dost thou, then, confound this selfe with feares,
That might'st see better daies ere age anneares,
And passe thy youth in being seru'd and lou'd,
That does deflorish, being vnimproued? 40
 But our opinions do not here runne euen,
I sing of earth, and thou discoursts of heauen.
 When I reioyce, thie saintly tongue replies,
'Theis are not waises that lead to Paradice'.
 I graunt it, and (Heauen pardon my amisse)
Am grieud such way should not be like to this,—
As ready found, as euenly delined,
Kept with like gates, as hard to be declined.
 But if thie awnse, thoughts auerse to loue,
Tend in a streight line to the ioyes aboue,
Then leauue the world behind thee, and bestow
That beauty from temptation and from show;
 Enter some sister-hood, and take new birth,
Where thou maist leade an angells life on earth;
 Or if thie vowe, already undergone,
Foreclose the way to such perfection,
 Yet fly from men, and wast thie insuinge yeares
In some dark angle fitt for praiers and teares,
 Where to this selfe and heauen thou maist professe,
And be in discipline an anchoresse. 50
 Foure happie lustres thou hast liud to see,
 And many more, by course, attend on thee
 Ere heauen take back what it is pleased to lend,
 And thie faire shadow to the graue descend;
 Of manie yeares, that to thy course are due,
In strict retirednes approue a few,
 That, whilst those sauinge shades do couer thee,
 Absence may practice my deliuery,
 And Time, thats full of counsell, may addresse
 Me wanderer to the way of happiness. 60
 55
 65
 70

48 gates] *hiatus H* hard] hard is *H* 69 may] do *H*

Perhaps the most noteworthy thing about Hare's poems is their representative quality. They demonstrate particularly well what was popular and fashionable among the young men of the Inns-of-Court in the first ten years of the seventeenth century. One sonnet in the 'Petrarchan' style, written, probably, while he was at Cambridge, survives (III): by the time he returned to London this vogue was thoroughly *passé*. It is not hard to see what replaced it. Of Hare's poems the first, and the seventh, eighth,

and ninth, are in the Roman love-elegy convention. The second and the fourth, though nearer to the epigram in form, also imitate the elegiac gestures and assumptions. Leaders in the love-elegy fashion were Campion, with his brilliant *Liber Elegiarum*, published in the 1595 *Poemata*, and Donne, whose English elegies, in so far as they can be dated from internal evidence, belong to the mid-1590's. Marlowe's notorious translation of the *Amores*, printed in 1595 or shortly after¹ and publicly burned in 1599 by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the frequent illustrative quotations from both the *Amores* and the *Ars Amatoria*² in Harington's extremely popular translation of the *Orlando Furioso*, 1591, are also symptomatic of the rapidly increasing enthusiasm for Ovid's erotic works. One of the main essentials of the love-elegy, as it was developed in England and, for that matter, as it had been developed in Italy and France during the sixteenth century by both neo-Latin and vernacular writers, was verisimilitude: the finished product must appear authentic and autobiographical. It is the constant particularization, the proliferation of concrete actualities and of topical references, which is often employed to this end, that brings the elegiac tradition in the 1590's so close to the satiric. There is no place here for a vague garden of love, as in the *Roman de la Rose* tradition; the scene of seduction is described with the exactitude of a police report (viii. 8-10). Mysterious references to the lady's 'new honours' (i. 21) or to the poet's return from a 'forraine kingdome' (viii. 22) are included to give an impression of life going on outside the poem. Elegiac love is always secret (i. 51, viii. 42, ix. 16-24): it is 'hidden love', 'secrett dalliance' (vii. 33-40): night (i. 61, vii. 36, viii. 11-12) and 'occasion' (i. 38, 43) are its 'secretaries' (i. 64, vii. 31). Its enemies are society, and the established trappings of love within society—husbands (ii. 16, ix. 7), parents (ix. 27), marriage (i. 55). Like his master, Ovid, the seventeenth-century elegiac poet is a *praecceptor amoris*: he expounds the art of love (i. 34-66, vii. 13, viii. 44, ix. 14-15): this role helps him to retain his aloofness and to assert his masculine superiority, which he is always anxious to do. Like Ovid, too, he is prepared to seduce the maid in order to gain access to the mistress (ix. 28-32).³ Like Ovid he begs dawn not to bring an end to his night of love (vii. 75).⁴ Often he grumbles about being jilted (i. 3-4, viii. 1 f.) in favour of a richer (viii. 32—note the common pun on 'angells') or more distinguished rival (i. 21), and laments the materialism of his own age (vi. 21-34, viii. 32), especially of modern woman (i. 23-24), comparing it bitterly with 'former times' when poets

¹ See J. M. Nosworthy, 'The Publication of Marlowe's Elegies', *R.E.S.*, n.s. iv. (1953), 260-1.

² See Harington, *Orlando Furioso* (1591), pp. 5, 30, 50-51, 63, 73-74, 96, 116, 126, 167, 231-2, 239, 359, &c.

³ *Ars Am.* i. 351-89.

⁴ *Amores*, i. xiii.

were properly respected. In his relationships with women he is rational and calculating: his interests are purely physical—love is ‘the businesse’ (I. 58) or ‘the game’ (VIII. 40). Not for him the transports and self-abasement of the sonneteers.

All these elegiac attitudes are to be found in the *Amores*, and, to a lesser extent, in the elegies of Propertius and Tibullus. So, too, is the theme¹ of Hare’s poem on the durability of art (vi): ‘Only devyner verses fly the Graue’ (l. 70)—‘Defugunt avidos carmina sola rogos’ (*Amores*, III. ix. 28).

In a genre so stereotyped as the early seventeenth-century love-elegy, a writer has to make only the smallest divergences from the conventional mannerisms to colour the poem with his own individuality. Thus in Poem VII, the intrusion of the much-imitated Catullian multiplied-kiss theme (21–28, 81–88) into the framework of an Ovidian elegy, and the sudden almost palinodial weariness of its culmination (89–100), coupled with the double-edged implications of the usury-love parallelism and the magnificent extraversion (‘Caesar and I shall rise as equall menn’) of that egotism always implicit in the insolent self-assurance of the elegiac lover, combine to make the poem an altogether more complex and equivocal piece of work than its companions. It illustrates well how, in the first part of the seventeenth century, the talented amateur was enabled to rise to otherwise unattainable heights by virtue of the well-formulated conventions which he appropriated.

¹ Cf. Propertius, III. ii. 17–26; *Amores*, I. xv. 31–42 and III. ix. 28–32.

THE 'TREE OF LIFE' SYMBOLISM IN PARADISE REGAIN'D

By JOHN M. STEADMAN

IN the celestial banquet at the end of *Paradise Regain'd* Professor Kermode has justly recognized both the complement of the diabolical banquet of sense in Book II and an example of the 'new rewards proposed for the new hero', which supersede the 'old rewards of heroism'.¹ Nevertheless, inasmuch as this scene serves as a focal point for a fairly wide range of concepts—especially the cluster of ideas associated with the biblical tree of life—it seems advisable to re-examine this passage in the light of some representative Renaissance interpretations of the *arbor vitae* of Genesis. For the most part, Reformation theologians exhibit little variation on this point. Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* agrees, on the whole, with the traditional conception of the tree of life, but displays a greater degree of independence on the question of its sacramental nature. Finally, I shall discuss a more controversial interpretation—that of the Renaissance Cabalist, John Reuchlin. Despite its theologically eccentric explanation of Genesis iii. 22, Reuchlin's application of this text to the Messiah may have contributed to Milton's picture of Christ's banquet on 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life'.

I

An early interpretation of the fruit of the tree of life as a heavenly recompence for obedience appears in the Jerusalem Targum on Genesis ii. 9. The tree itself signifies the law, and its fruit is acquired through obedience:

He prepared the garden of Eden for the righteous, that they should eat, and delight themselves with the fruit of the tree, because they had kept the commandments of the law in this world. . . . For the law is the tree of life; whoever keepeth it in this life liveth and subsisteth as the tree of life. The law is good to keep in this world, as the fruit of the tree of life in the world that cometh.²

Reformation theologians frequently regarded the *arbor vitae* as a sacrament signifying eternal life on the condition of obedience. Calvin, explaining that 'Sacramenti nomen . . . omnia generaliter signa complectitur quae unquam hominibus mandavit Deus, ut certiores securosque de promissionum suarum veritate redderet', classified the tree of life as an example of a sacrament 'in rebus naturalibus': 'Prioris generis exempla sunt, ut

¹ F. Kermode, 'Milton's Hero', *R.E.S.*, n.s. iv (1953), 317–30.

² J. W. Etheridge (tr.), *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch; with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee*, i (London, 1862), 169.

quum Adae & Hevae arborem vitae in arrhabonem immortalitatis dedit, ut eam securè sibi promitterent, quandiu ederent ex illius fructu.¹ Polanus cited Genesis ii. 9 and Revelation ii. 7 as proof texts for the doctrine that 'the tree of life in paradise was a type of eternall life'—a sacrament promising immortality:

The tree of life was a Sacrament, by which there was signified and sealed to our first parents, eating the fruit of this tree, that immortall life should in the Sonne of God be continued unto them, if they continued in the obedience of God.²

Wolleb believed it to be a sacrament ratifying eternal happiness under the covenant of works:

The Covenant of works was confirmed by a double Sacrament; to wit, the Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil. . . . They had a double use. 1. That man's obedience might be tried by using of the one, and abstaining from the other. 2. That the tree of life might ratifie eternal happiness to those that should obey, but the Tree of knowledge should signifie to the disobedient the loss of the greatest happiness, and the possession of the greatest misery.³

Similarly, John Diodati, commenting on Genesis ii. 9, declared that God had set the tree of life in the garden of Eden

. . . for a Sacrament, of the subsistence and spirituall life of man, in the grace and communion of the Lord, so long as he should persevere in Justice and Obedience. And to it is correspondent Jesus Christ, in the heavenly Paradise.⁴

Rivetus also stressed the causal relation between obedience and the celestial fruit:

Sed arbor illa sic dicta fuit, quod esset Sacramentum seu divinum signum atque testimonium, quod Adam, cum in vita hac terrena conservandus, tum maximè quod in vitam coelestem transferendus esset, si persisteret in obedientia mandatorum Dei, quippe per quorum transgressionem, mortem sibi attracturus erat. Quapropter, exclusione ab arbore vitae, significare voluit Deus eum jus illud ad vitam amisisse.⁵

Milton, on the other hand, rejected the interpretation of the *arbor vitae* as a sacrament, and laid primary emphasis on its significance as a symbol of immortality:

The tree of life, in my opinion, ought not to be considered so much a sacrament, as a symbol of eternal life, or rather perhaps the nutriment by which that

¹ *Institutionis Christianae Religionis Libri Quatuor* (Genevae, 1617), f. 265.

² Amandus Polanus, *The Substance of Christian Religion* (Genevae, 1617), pp. 168, 297.

³ John Wollebius, *The Abridgment of Christian Divinitie*, tr. A. Ross (3rd edn. London, 1660), p. 68.

⁴ *Pious Annotations upon the Holy Bible* (London, 1643), p. 4; cf. p. 7.

⁵ Andreas Rivetus, *Theologiae & Scholasticae Exercitationes CXC. in Genesin* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1633), p. 204.

life is sustained. Gen. iii. 22. 'Lest he take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.' Rev. ii. 7. 'to him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life.'

In view of Milton's denial that the tree of life is a sacrament, we can scarcely regard the 'Celestial Food' of *Paradise Regain'd* as sacramental in nature. Nevertheless, it does, apparently, exhibit at least one sacramental characteristic according to Milton's definition—'a visible sign ordained by God, whereby he sets his seal on believers'. Nor is its meaning remote from the interpretation Polanus attached to the tree of life, 'by which there was signified to our first parents, eating the fruit of this tree, that immortall life should in the Sonne of God be continued unto them', if they remained obedient. In fact, Milton's Messianic banquet is precisely such a 'signifying' and 'sealing' of 'immortall life . . . in the Sonne of God'—a divine confirmation of 'Recover'd Paradise to all mankind'.

II

These interpretations of the biblical *arbor vitae* stress several points which seem basic to Milton's own treatment of these 'Fruits . . . from the tree of life'—their significance as (1) a 'symbol of eternal life', (2) a reward merited specifically by obedience to God's commandments, and (3) a detail particularly characteristic of Paradise. Milton could have expected his 'fit audience' to be well acquainted with these concepts and, accordingly, to be able to utilize them as a frame of reference for interpreting the symbolism of the celestial banquet. In the light of these traditional explanations of the *arbor vitae* we may more readily evaluate its significance for the development of Milton's theme and the structure of his fable.

1. In the first place, as a conventional symbol of eternal life, the 'Fruits . . . from the tree of life' occupy an important position in the ethical structure of *Paradise Regain'd*. They are an integral part of the inherent pattern of contrasting ideals of heroic virtue and its rewards, in which Kermode has recognized the basic moral concern of this epic: 'The whole poem . . . is concerned to establish the character of Christian heroic virtue as distinct from pagan, and to establish the heavenly nature of the rewards which supersede the earthly recompense of the old heroes.' After overcoming his third and final temptation (Kermode observes) Milton's hero receives 'his supernatural rewards, heavenly glory, and the banquet of celestial love'.²

More particularly, Kermode interprets the heavenly banquet as a

¹ *Prose Works*, iv. *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, tr. C. R. Sumner (London, 1883), p. 222.

² Kermode, p. 329.

eat, and
the tree

we can
mental in
dained
remote
there
nortall
ained
'signi-
divine

points
m the
ward
(3) a
ected
ingly,
g the
al ex-
cance

Fruits
truc-
ttern
node
...
stinct
which
ning
eives
estinal

as a
883),

STEADMAN: MILTON'S 'TREE OF LIFE' SYMBOLISM 387

reward for the temperance Christ has displayed in rejecting the sensual feast of Book II:

... Milton balances this celestial banquet with a banquet of sense, which Jesus rejects so that he may attain to the higher angelic banquet. . . . At the end of the poem he has his proper reward:

A table of Celestial Food, Divine
Ambrosial, Fruits fetcht from the tree of life,
And from the fount of life Ambrosial drink. (iv. 588-90)

In place of the sensual banquet, the material gratifications of the conqueror, he has a celestial banquet, a banquet of love and of heavenly glory.¹

Nevertheless, the primary significance of the celestial banquet for Milton's pattern of contrasting rewards lies in the conventional symbolism of the *arbor vitae* as a 'type' of eternal life. The principal reason why Christ's heavenly feast transcends 'the earthly recompense of the old heroes' is to be found not so much in its intrinsic superiority to the 'sensual banquet' *qua* banquet or even in its heavenly nature, as in the fact that it signifies an *eternal* recompense. In this scene Milton has exploited the familiar Christian concept of everlasting life as a *remuneratio aeterna*.

Again, it is as a symbol of eternal life that the celestial feast highlights Christ's superiority to the 'old type' of hero. Messiah alone is able to conquer the 'two grand foes', Sin and Death, and he is appropriately rewarded with a symbol of eternal life. The conventional 'conquering hero', on the other hand, is corrupted by sin and recompensed with death:

Till Conquerour Death discover them scarce men,
Rowling in brutish vices, and deform'd,
Violent or shameful death thir due reward.

The celestial banquet of *Paradise Regain'd* is antithetical, moreover, not only to the stately feast Satan offers the Messiah in this epic, but also to the 'Fruit of that Forbidden Tree' in *Paradise Lost*. The secular banquet and the forbidden fruit are linked not only as logical opposites of the heavenly feast, but also by Milton's explicit comparison between the elaborate 'Cates' offered to Christ and 'that crude Apple that diverted Eve'. Furthermore, at least one recent scholar has recognized in the 'banqueting scene' of Book II the influence of 'Protestant-Catholic controversy about the *cibus ligni vetitus*'.²

The antithesis between the logical contraries Death and Life underlies both of Milton's epics and is clearly symbolized by the two trees of Paradise. Tasting the fruit of the one brought death and the 'loss of *Eden*';

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 324-5.

² See E. M. Pope, *Paradise Regained: The Tradition and the Poem* (Baltimore, 1947), 70-79. Kermode (p. 324 n.) disagrees with Miss Pope's interpretation.

partaking of the other constituted an affirmation of eternal life and '*Eden rais'd in the wast Wilderness*'. This contrasting symbolism had, moreover, been clearly expressed in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*:

... and next to Life
Our Death the Tree of Knowledge grew fast by. . . .
 . . . that onely Tree
Of knowledge, planted by the Tree of Life,
So neer grows Death to Life. . . .

In the 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life' of *Paradise Regain'd* we must recognize the antithesis of the fatal fruit of the tree of knowledge in *Paradise Lost*,

. . . the Fruit
Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast
Brought Death into the world, and all our woe. . . .

2. In the final analysis, the pattern of contrasting rewards in both epics involves considerably more than the opposition of different heroic ideals and the sort of recompense they seek and achieve. Underlying the structure of both poems there is a more obvious, but fundamental, antithesis—the simple moral opposition between true virtue and sin, between obedience and disobedience and the contrasting rewards they merit—eternal life and death. On the one hand, everlasting life is the 'fruit' and reward of Christ's obedience; on the other hand, the 'fruit' of disobedience, the 'wages of sin', is death.

As the fruit of the *arbor vitae* had been traditionally regarded as a reward for conforming to God's commands, we should recognize in Christ's celestial feast a conventional recompense for obedience. The 'table of Celestial Food' is remuneration for far more than the mere rejection of the sensual banquet, just as the 'heavenly glory' represented by the angelic hymn is recompense for considerably more than the mere renunciation of worldly glory. They are a reward Christ earns through his *entire* ordeal—a recompense for his 'firm obedience fully tri'd | Through *all* temptation' [italics mine]. The 'Celestial Food' he receives represents the divine approbation of his unshaken obedience.

3. In the third place, these 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life' are an unequivocal sign of 'Recover'd Paradise'. They provide, therefore, an appropriate conclusion to an epic whose announced theme is *Paradise regained*.

As the tree of life was peculiarly indigenous to Paradise, Christ's participation in its fruits signifies that he has regained 'the blissful Seat'—that 'A fairer Paradise is founded now | For *Adam* and his chosen Sons'. With this clear-cut symbol of '*Eden rais'd in the wast Wilderness*', Milton brought his epic fable to its logical conclusion. The heroic poem (Aristotle

and Tasso had taught him) is an 'imitation of an action',¹ and the particular action he had chosen to imitate ('Recover'd Paradise') had been explicitly stated in the first lines—and, indeed, in the very title—of his poem. This final section of the poem completes the sequence of events outlined in the first verses of the epic. After demonstrating how Paradise was regained ('By one man's firm obedience fully tri'd'), after leaving the Tempter 'foil'd | In all his wiles, defeated and repuls'd', Milton must logically conclude his action with '*Eden rais'd*'. This concept he conveyed symbolically through Christ's celestial banquet on the fruits of the *arbor vitae* and explicitly through the angelic hymn of praise:

... now thou hast aveng'd
Supplanted *Adam*, and by vanquishing
Temptation, hast regain'd lost Paradise. . . .

This allusion to the tree of life reinforces the antithesis between the loss of Paradise through Adam and its recovery through Christ. The *arbor vitae* was not only characteristic of 'the happy Garden', but also indirectly involved in man's expulsion. God's avowed reason for exiling Adam (Gen. iii. 22) was 'lest he . . . take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever'. And it was 'to keep the way of the tree of life' that cherubim (Gen. iii. 24) with fiery arms had been stationed at the entrance to the garden.

Nevertheless, it is not to the Garden of Eden but to the heavenly Paradise that Milton's lines refer. As the 'seat of earthly bliss' has 'fail'd', the *arbor vitae* is now peculiarly indigenous to Heaven. The 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life' are, therefore, 'Celestial Food' in the fullest sense—signs or attributes of the 'fairer Paradise . . . founded now | For *Adam* and his chosen Sons' rather than of the earthly Paradise Adam had forfeited.

III

When ministering angels set before Messiah 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life', they are not only testifying to his recovery of Paradise. They are also bearing witness to his Messiahship. Traditionally, the tree of life was not only a distinctive feature of the 'happy Garden'; it was also closely associated with Christ's mission as redeemer.² In Reuchlin's *De Arte Cabalistica*, God's command to expel man from Paradise 'lest he . . . take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever' had been interpreted as a veiled prediction that a future saviour would appear, destined to eat of the tree of life ('homo ad vescendum de ligno vitae destinatus' (f. x)):

¹ Tasso, *Prose*, ed. F. Flora (Milan and Rome, 1935), p. 331: 'il poema eroico è una imitazione d'azione illustre', &c. Cf. I. Bywater (tr.), *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Oxford, 1920), p. 35.

² See my article, 'Adam and the Prophesied Redeemer', *S.P.*, lvi (1959), 214-25.

'... & ille per rectam fidem & placidam oblationem mittet manum suam, et sumet de ligno vitae, & eius ligni fructus erit omnium sperantium salus.' At least two of several commentaries on Genesis which Milton is known to have consulted—those of Rivetus and Musculus¹—quote this passage, even though they doubt its application to Christ.² Milton was, therefore, in all probability familiar with it, even though he may have agreed with the scepticism expressed by Rivetus and Musculus. Nevertheless, the likelihood that he did not take this passage seriously as Scriptural exegesis did not preclude his exploiting it for essentially poetic ends. Inasmuch as 'Fruits . . . from the tree of life' had been regarded as one of the hallmarks of the Messiah, the introduction of this detail lends both verisimilitude and decorum to Milton's account of Christ's celestial banquet.

Moreover, in discussing this text, Reuchlin emphasizes many of the ethical characteristics prominent in the Christ of *Paradise Regain'd*—especially the rejection of worldly glory and the preference for humility and patience:

Nos . . . Messiham esse venturum putamus ad liberandum miseros humani generis mortales, de vinculis iniustiae originalis, ad dimittendum peccata, & ad salvandum pie Deo servientium animas, in Adam patre nostro a vita aetherna exclusas, usque ad satisfactiōnem Messiae, qui ut consummetur iusticia misericordis & clementis Dei manum suam mittat, & sumat de ligno vitae & comedat de eo, ut per illum vivamus in aeternum. Et satisfactio non in fastu regio, nec iactantia honoris ac gloriae fieri debuit, eo quod originale peccatum a Messia expiandum, de superbia & elatione pullulavit. Quin potius in humilitate ac tolerantia, non in curribus & in equis, sed in nomine Domini Dei nostri, & non in victoria, nec humano triumpho, sed in labore, ieunio, vigilijs, fortitudine animi, contemptu cenodoxiae, misericordia compassibili, amore Dei praecipuo, dilectione hominum recta, & in ipsa tandem heroica liberali ac spontanea morte, quoniam contra vitium sola virtute pugnat, & imperia, principatus, stemmata, coronas, huius seculi nemo sapiens unquam magni duxit. (ff. xix–xx)

Thus the primary significance of Christ's celestial banquet is largely based on conventional Renaissance interpretations of the *arbor vitae*. By

¹ See A. Williams, 'Renaissance Commentaries on "Genesis" and Some Elements of the Theology of *Paradise Lost*', *P.M.L.A.*, lvi (1941), 151–64; 'Milton and the Renaissance Commentaries on Genesis', *M.P.*, xxxvii (1940), 263–78.

² Rivetus, p. 201; Wolfgangus Musculus, *In Genesim Mosis Commentarij* (Basileae, 1600), p. 109. After quoting Reuchlin's interpretation, Rivetus comments, 'Mirum est homines doctos & pios, talibus commentis non solum fidem adhibere, sed ea etiam commendare. . . . Quis enim unquam sibi persuaderi sinet, tale mysterium sub his verbis latere?' Musculus gives a similar verdict, 'Verum torta exposicio verborum istorum probari non potest, utpote quod illud, *Ecce Adam est quasi unus ex nobis*, ad hunc modum: Et nunc in praesenti hoc tempore, ne iste meus in aeternitate unicis, qui subsistit ex meipso, manum suam mittat, & sumat etiam de ligno vitae, &c., cum haec non de Christo, sed primo Adamo sint dicta.'

a skilful exploitation of exegetical traditions, Milton concludes his epic of 'Recover'd Paradise' with a detail closely associated not only with eternal life and the merited reward of obedience, but also with Paradise itself and the Messianic mission of redemption. Central to this episode is the complex symbolism of 'Fruits fetcht from the tree of life'. The scene is a triumph of significant detail.

WORDSWORTH, COLERIDGE, AND THE MORNING POST: AN EARLY VERSION OF 'THE SEVEN SISTERS'

By CAROL LANDON

IN 1838, in a letter to Daniel Stuart, former Editor of the *Morning Post* and the *Courier*, Wordsworth had occasion to declare how small a number of his works had been written for newspapers or periodicals. He was convinced that no poem of his had ever appeared in the *Morning Post*, other than 'The Farmer of Tilsbury Vale'—which appeared there or in the *Courier*—and a few political sonnets, written, he stressed, without any view to emolument.¹ In the course of time, however, various other poems by Wordsworth have been found in the *Morning Post* during the period when Coleridge was a recognized contributor, from late 1797 to 1802.² Moreover, some poems formerly attributed to Coleridge, which appeared under pseudonyms in the *Morning Post*, are now known to be Wordsworth's or to be adaptations of his work.³ J. W. Smyser, writing in 1950 on 'Coleridge's Use of Wordsworth's Juvenilia', identified some of these pieces and showed that they were almost certainly sent in by Coleridge, Wordsworth having handed them over to him to help him to fulfil his contract with Stuart.⁴ R. A. Potts had earlier reached the same conclusion with regard to 'The Convict', published in the *Morning Post* on 14 December 1797;⁵ and E. de Selincourt made suggestions on the same lines regarding two poems published in the *Morning Post* in 1800, 'Inscription for a

¹ *Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years*, ed. E. de Selincourt (Oxford, 1939), ii. 941. 'The Farmer of Tilsbury Vale' appeared in the *Morning Post* (unsigned) on 21 July 1800.

² Coleridge's verse contributions date from December 1797. Nobody, as far as I know, has mentioned that a major prose contribution, a political article headed 'Lord Moira's Letter', appeared as early as 20 Jan. 1798. A letter from Stuart to Coleridge, a copy of which was forwarded to him by Poole, identifies the article as Coleridge's. See B.M. Add. MS. 35343, f. 168 (Correspondence of T. Poole).

³ 'Lewti' was the only one republished by Coleridge himself. It originated from Wordsworth's 'Beauty and Moonlight', as E. H. W. Meyerstein and J. Sutherland pointed out (*T.L.S.*, 29 Nov. and 6 Dec. 1941), but the finished work was very largely Coleridge's.

⁴ *P.M.L.A.*, lxxv (1950), 419–26. 'Morienti Superstes', however, was not published in the *Morning Post* along with 'Moriens Superstiti'. The latter appeared alone (with a prefatory note but without a title) on 10 May 1798. It is to be found among Wordsworth's early manuscripts. See M. Moorman, *William Wordsworth. A Biography* (Oxford, 1957), p. 352.

⁵ *Athenaeum*, 13 Aug. 1904.

Seat by a Road Side . . .' and 'Alcaeus to Sappho'.¹ This entanglement with Coleridge, added to the difficulty of remembering accurately after so many years, helps to account for Wordsworth's disclaimer to Stuart in 1838.

A new search through the *Morning Post* adds at least two poems to this list of contributions provided by Wordsworth and presumably submitted by Coleridge. It is already known that Wordsworth's sonnet 'If grief dismiss me not to them that rest'² was published in the *Morning Post*, signed W. W., on 13 February 1798; I now find that on the same day his 'Translation of a Celebrated Greek Song' ('I will bear my vengeful blade')³ was printed over the signature 'Publicola'. Both these poems—the first is taken from Petrarch⁴—open up interesting topics, but my immediate purpose is to refer to another poem from the *Morning Post*: 'The Seven Sisters', which appeared there on 14 October 1800, under the title 'The Solitude of Binnorie, or the Seven Daughters of Lord Archibald Campbell'.

Wordsworth included this piece in his *Poems in Two Volumes* (1807), with a note to the effect that the story was taken 'from the German of Frederica Brun'.⁵ The *Morning Post* offers an earlier version (I have appended a transcript) together with this note on the poem's metrical origin:

To the Editor of the Morning Post

SIR,

It would be unpardonable in the author of the following lines, if he omitted to acknowledge that the metre (with exception of the burthen) is borrowed from 'The Haunted Beach of Mrs. ROBINSON,' a most exquisite Poem, first given to the public, if I recollect aright, in your paper, and since then re-published in the second volume of Mr. SOUTHEY'S Annual Anthology. This acknowledgment will not appear superfluous to those who have felt the bewitching effect of that absolutely original stanza in the original Poem, and who call to mind that the invention of a metre has so widely diffused the name of Sappho, and almost constitutes the present celebrity of Alcaeus.

M. H.

This helps us, in the first place, to date 'The Seven Sisters', which must have been composed between 26 February 1800, the day that 'The

¹ *Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt and H. Darbishire (Oxford, 1940-9), i. 372, ii. 531.

² Ibid. i. 308.

³ Ibid., p. 299.

⁴ This sonnet reappeared in the *Morning Post*, with a few variations, on 2 Feb. 1802, and the source 'Se la mia vita da l'aspro tormento' was acknowledged. Stuart published two, or perhaps three, other poems by Wordsworth about this time: 'Dear Child of Nature . . .', 'Calm is all nature . . .', and 'Written in a Grotto' (?). The group deserves fuller treatment than I can give it here. The poems were sent in, I think, by Wordsworth, but Coleridge may have been involved financially.

⁵ From 'Die sieben Hügel', published in *Gedichte von Friderike Brun* (Zurich, 1795). A poem of hers addressed to Klopstock provided Coleridge with some of the material for his 'Hymn before Sunrise, in the Vale of Chamouni'. Both these debts were discussed by Max Förster (*Academy*, 27 June 1896).

'Haunted Beach' appeared in the *Morning Post*, and 17 August 1800, when Wordsworth read it aloud on the way home from a visit to the Coleridges at Keswick.¹

The note also raises some interesting questions. Before attempting to answer them one needs to have a list of the verse contributions of Coleridge and Wordsworth to the *Morning Post* in October and November 1800. They were as follows: the issue for 13 October contained Coleridge's 'The Voice from the Side of Etna; or, The Mad Monk. An Ode, in Mrs Ratcliff's manner', signed 'CASSIANI, jun.'; on 14 October came 'The Solitude of Binnorie'; and on 21 October Wordsworth's 'Inscription for a Seat . . .'-as this was the seat by the road leading to Windy Brow the poem was signed 'VENTIFRONS'. 'Alcaeus to Sappho' followed on 24 November.

Mrs. Robinson, as we shall see, appears to have been connected with three of these four poems. She was, of course, the famous 'Perdita', one time actress and mistress of the Prince of Wales. She was now living in reduced circumstances; for some years too she had been partially disabled, but she was nevertheless an assiduous author. The poem referred to by 'M. H.' describes a beach haunted by a band of spectres, the drowned mates of a shipwrecked sailor who has been murdered by a fisherman:

The SPECTRE *band*, his MESSMATES bold,
Sunk in the yawning ocean!
While to the mast, he lashed him fast,
And brav'd the storm's commotion!
The winter MOON upon the sand
A silv'ry carpet made,
And mark'd the SAILOR reach the land—
And mark'd his MURD'RER wash his hand,
Where the green billows play'd!

The fisherman now toils in vain and wastes away his miserable life,

For HEAV'N designed his guilty mind
Should feed on prospects dreary!

Readers will recognize in this the guilt theme that inspired a number of Wordsworth's and Coleridge's own poems but, unlike them, 'The Haunted Beach' shows no strong interest in psychology or moral regeneration. The poem's merits in other directions, however, were sufficient to win the approval of Coleridge, whose admiration, and sympathy, for Mrs. Robinson are well known; and I suspect that he was responsible for, or at least had a hand in, this glowing acknowledgement in the 'M. H.' note. The reference

¹ *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt (London, 1941), i. 55.

to the author of 'The Solitude of Binnorie'—Mrs. Robinson's debtor—is in the third person, conventionally enough but on this occasion perhaps significantly; and there is no other record, so far as I know, of Wordsworth praising Mrs. Robinson's work. It was through Coleridge that 'The Haunted Beach' had been included in the *Annual Anthology*. In a letter to Southey, postmarked 28 February 1800, he writes:

In the *Morning Post* was a poem of fascinating Metre by Mary Robinson—'twas on Wednesday, Feb. 26—and entitled the *Haunted Beach*. I was so struck with it that I sent to her to desire that [it] might be preserved in the *Anthology*—She was extremely flattered by the Idea of its being there, as she idolizes you & your Doings. So if it be not too late, I pray you, let it be in . . . it falls off sadly to the last—wants Tale—and Interest; but the Images are new & very distinct—that 'silvery carpet' is so just, that it is unfortunate it should seem so bad—for it is really good—but the Metre—ay! that Woman has an Ear.¹

Mrs. Robinson was a constant contributor to the *Morning Post*, and Sappho was one of her pseudonyms. In 1799 Coleridge had commented on a poem of Wordsworth's, 'How sweet where crimson colours',² and on 7 October 1800 he sent this to the Editor of the *Morning Post* with the title 'Alcaeus to Sappho'.³ We can only conjecture how far he had refashioned it, but, as E. de Selincourt remarks, it is safe to assume that he was responsible for the title and for the name Sappho in stanza 4.⁴ In view of Mrs. Robinson's pseudonym it has been pointed out that the poem was probably addressed (by Coleridge) to her.⁵ The 'M. H.' note confirms this supposition, by providing an analogy. It shows Coleridge obviously making play with the pseudonym and introducing the original Sappho as a means of heightening the compliment paid to Mrs. Robinson. To couple Alcaeus' name with Sappho's was natural enough, for these two Greek metrists were contemporaries and one of Alcaeus' odes was indeed addressed to Sappho. But the fact that the names were linked by Coleridge on both the occasions under review suggests that he was establishing a clear connexion between the headnote to 'The Solitude of Binnorie' and his own 'Alcaeus to Sappho'. Considering their friendship, I imagine that he would mean Mrs. Robinson to recognize his hand in these two contexts, and the references to Alcaeus may have had some private significance which afforded her a clue. The headnote introduces the name pointedly though neatly, and no one else among the *Morning Post*'s contributors of verse at this

¹ Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, ed. E. L. Griggs (Oxford, 1956), i. 575.

² Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, ed. E. de Selincourt (Oxford, 1935), p. 222.

³ Letters, i. 629.

⁴ Poetical Works, ii. 531.

⁵ See Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), i. 353. It should also be noted that Mrs. Robinson's lines 'To the Poet Coleridge', first published in her *Memoirs* in 1801, are signed 'Sappho' and dated 'Oct. 1800'.

period seems to have used it, in relation to 'Sappho' or otherwise, although pen names of the same kind were much in evidence. Coleridge himself may have felt a special kinship with Alcaeus by virtue of his political verse and his strong interest in metre. Whether Mrs. Robinson would be able to identify the author of 'The Solitude of Binnorie' is another matter.

The question that arises next is whether 'The Mad Monk', published the day before 'The Solitude of Binnorie', also played a part in the exchange of compliments between Coleridge and Mrs. Robinson—an exchange which included at this juncture two verse tributes from her pen.¹ There is some evidence that it did, though I am not implying that it was necessarily composed with her in mind. It is a problematical poem, with its Wordsworthian undertones, and I shall only refer to it briefly. Mrs. Robinson's daughter printed it, under Coleridge's name, in her anthology *The Wild Wreath*, published in 1804. Differences as compared with the *Morning Post* version suggest that she had a manuscript. Mrs. Robinson herself had written several poems about hermits. The type was so common² that I hesitate to find any coincidence in this fact, but it is worth noticing that in 'Anselmo, the Hermit of the Alps' there is a setting of mountain and forest, and the hero, like Coleridge's 'monk', has been passionately in love with a girl called Rosa. Another poem by Mrs. Robinson was entitled 'The Hermit of Mont Blanc' when it appeared in the *Monthly Magazine* of February 1800, but became 'The Murdered Maid' in her collected poems, possibly echoing the phrase 'murder'd maiden' which occurs in the *Wild Wreath* version of 'The Mad Monk', for the Coleridge–Robinson friendship did in fact produce several instances of cross referencing of this sort.³ 'CASSIANI, jun.', the pseudonym selected for 'The Mad Monk' when it was sent to the *Morning Post*, may stand for '[The work] of the younger Cassianus', or possibly for

¹ 'To the Poet Coleridge' (see previous footnote) and 'Ode, inscribed to the Infant Son of S. T. Coleridge, Esq. . . .', published in the *Morning Post* on 17 Oct. 1800, dated 'October 12'.

² Even by 1787 we find a reviewer of 'A Hermit's Tale', by Sophia Lee, suggesting that it 'would show more genius in a writer of character to choose some other subject for the exercise of her muse, than one so hackneyed . . .' (*European Magazine*, Feb. 1787).

³ For instance, 'To the Poet Coleridge' echoes 'Kubla Khan' (presumably from a manuscript). Coleridge's 'A Stranger Minstrel' echoes Mrs. Robinson's 'The Haunted Beach' and 'Jasper'; and his stanzas on 'The Snowdrop' echo Mrs. Robinson's poem on the Snowdrop contained in her novel *Walsingham*. Coleridge's 'Snowdrop' is included in the draft of a letter addressed, but perhaps never sent, to Stuart, which E. L. Griggs conjecturally dates 'Late October 1800' (*Letters*, i. 639). It has been suggested to me, however, that these lines may have been written earlier, and I would be inclined to agree. Extracts from *Walsingham*, and other readers' tributes to the novel, appeared in the *Morning Post*, 1797–8. I have not been able to find the 'Snowdrop' extract—or Coleridge's 'Snowdrop'—but a few issues are missing from the British Museum file. Coleridge in any case would doubtless read the verses in *Walsingham*. Stuart sent him 'Mrs. Robinson's novel'—and reported her admiration for his contributions to the *Morning Post*—in January 1798 (B.M. Add. MS. 35343, f. 168).

'The younger Cassiani', indicating Coleridge and Wordsworth as joint authors. At all events the name has hermit associations, for the original Cassianus was a fourth- and fifth-century theologian and monk who had lived as a hermit in Egypt.¹ There is another point we might notice: the mountain scenery near Keswick—particularly Skiddaw, which to the north dominated the prospect from Coleridge's house—figures prominently in Mrs. Robinson's poem to Coleridge's son, and also in Coleridge's poem to her, 'A Stranger Minstrel', and in a letter of hers to Coleridge,² both written a few weeks before her death, which occurred in December 1800. The letter also speaks of 'your chosen retreat' (we recall Wordsworth's 'hermitage' and *The Recluse*). Mountain hermits then, 'real' and literary, may have been a current topic between Coleridge and Mrs. Robinson, and it is, of course, just possible that the subject offers a clue to 'M. H.', though admittedly these initials leave much room for speculation. If they did signify 'Mountain Hermit', for Mrs. Robinson's benefit, they would be partially echoing the 'Cassiani' signature of the previous day (compare the two references to Alceaus).

A more obvious interpretation is that the initials were borrowed from Mary Hutchinson, with her consent, or at least on the assumption that she would agree with the sentiments expressed; and she may well have discussed 'The Haunted Beach' with the Wordsworths when it appeared in the *Morning Post*, as she visited Grasmere about that time.³ Her intimacy with the Wordsworths was already of long standing, and Coleridge too had been established as a personal friend of the Hutchinsons since his visit to Sockburn the previous year. Apart from Dorothy, and perhaps John Wordsworth, Mary was the person most likely, I think, to share the secret of the Wordsworth-Coleridge contributions to the *Morning Post*.

In part then the note remains something of a puzzle. As far as personal relationships are concerned it adds a little to our knowledge of the friendship that existed between Coleridge and Mrs. Robinson, and it gives us some idea of yet another episode in the friendship between Coleridge and Wordsworth. The fact that 'The Solitude of Binnorie' was republished by Wordsworth suggests that he had more regard for this poem than he had for most of the pieces that he handed over to Coleridge. But Coleridge, for Mrs. Robinson's sake, would be anxious to see the poem in print at an early date—with the appropriate acknowledgement—and it looks as though Wordsworth good-naturedly yielded it up by special request. Coleridge would be doubly gratified that the gift subscribed to the pattern of his

¹ There was also an Italian poet Giuliano Cassiani (1712–78); possibly Coleridge welcomed this further complication when he chose the pseudonym.

² Coleridge quoted this letter in a letter to Poole (*Letters*, ii. 669).

³ *Early Letters*, p. 242 (no. 107).

relationship with Mrs. Robinson and at the same time helped him to discharge his obligations to Stuart. Wordsworth for his part was under some obligation to Coleridge for the help given him at this period in preparing the *Lyrical Ballads* for the printer.

Whether or not Wordsworth's opinion of 'The Haunted Beach' as a whole matched Coleridge's, the fact remains that he admired the stanza form enough to adopt it, and Mrs. Robinson, by contributing in this way to the metrical variety of the *Poems in Two Volumes*, takes a place alongside many more distinguished writers.¹ A probable reason why Wordsworth chose so new a stanza form for this particular story may be found in the Fenwick note to 'Ellen Irwin', a poem written most likely in 1799 or 1800:

It may be worth while to observe that as there are Scotch Poems on the subject in the simple ballad strain, I thought it would be both presumptuous and superfluous to attempt treating it in the same way; and, accordingly, I chose a construction of stanza quite new in our language; in fact the same as that of Bürger's *Leonora*, except that the first and third line do not, in my stanzas, rhyme. . . .

A poem on the seven sisters involved a similar, if lesser, danger of appearing to imitate the Scottish ballads too closely, for the story was clearly of the traditional ballad type. Moreover, Friderike Brun had already told it in a comparatively 'simple strain'—a stanza of four lines, the third and fourth rhyming, with a two-line burden. Wordsworth himself went so far as to add a burden to his untraditional stanza, and to give it something of the haunting quality of the old ballads he made it echo a traditional refrain, from a version of 'The Twa Sisters' (another story of drowning)—though its lamen is also reminiscent of 'Die sieben Hügel'.

Differences between the 1800 and the 1807 versions of 'The Solitude of Binnorie' are worth noticing. It seems that the earliest (Longman) manuscript is the copy for the printers of the 1807 volumes, and this evidently agrees, except at one point, with the 1807 printed text.² There is no evidence of Coleridge's hand either before or after the poem's publication in the *Morning Post*, and I assume that the revisions are Wordsworth's. They indicate, as we should expect, a certain amount of polishing. For instance the jingle of line 6, 'Together did they dwell', is abandoned in favour of 'Seven Sisters that together dwell'; and the description at the beginning of stanza 3:

Close by a grotto of their own,
The Seven, in rural fashion,
Beneath a tree were sitting, free
From all unquiet passion

¹ See *Poems in Two Volumes*, 1807, ed. H. Darbishire (Oxford, 2nd edn. 1952), Appendix II: Scheme of Metrical Sources, p. 464.

² *A Description of the Wordsworth and Coleridge Manuscripts in the possession of Mr. T. Norton Longman*, ed. W. Hale White (London, 1897), p. 52.

gives place to the more charming notion,

Beside a Grotto of their own,
With boughs above them closing,
The Seven are laid, and in the shade
They lie like Fawns reposing.

The account of the sisters' death was also altered, to exclude the simile of the mountain sheep (l. 51). Presumably Wordsworth decided that this was too 'rude' an image for the 'seven fair Campbells', particularly as they had now been compared to fawns! And even if we admit that the sheep rightly suggest the sisters flocking close together we can hardly quarrel with him for making this alteration. It is here that the Longman MS. (quoted by de Selincourt and Darbshire)¹ differs from the printed poem of 1807. The simile still appears in the manuscript version, so the change was evidently made at the last minute, after the copy for the printer had been sent off.

One other variation should be mentioned. The final stanza in the 1807 volume records that

Seven little Islands, green and bare,
Have risen from out the deep:
The Fishers say, those Sisters fair
By Faeries are all buried there,
And there together sleep.

The first two lines here—which are an improvement rhythmically—introduce a new feature into the story, for there are no islands in the earlier version. Instead it retains the 'sieben Hügel' of Friderike Brun's poem, but presents them more graphically:

Each like a tall maid's grave, there are
Seven mossy heaps hard by. . . .

We are at once reminded of 'The Thorn':

This heap of earth o'ergrown with moss,
Which close beside the Thorn you see,
So fresh in all its beauteous dyes,
Is like an infant's grave in size,
As like as like can be. . . . (49-53)

Also close by was the little pond where some say Martha drowned her baby. The seven sisters, we recall, were drowned in the lake, and the mounds are hard by the stream that flows out of it. In both poems (and in both versions of 'The Seven Sisters') it is the local people—including, of

¹ *Poetical Works*, ii. 148; *Poems in Two Volumes*, 1807, pp. 368 and 459.

course, the narrator in 'The Thorn'—who offer an unsophisticated explanation of the relevant landmarks. However, in their narrative method the two poems are far enough apart, as S. M. Parrish indicated in his article 'Dramatic Technique in the *Lyrical Ballads*'.¹ The credulous fishermen are the merest remnants so to speak of the retired mariner, or even of the shepherd in 'Hart-leap Well', written early in 1800. Yet Wordsworth took the trouble to add this touch of rural characterization to Friderike Brun's story—for she tells us straightforwardly that the sisters lie in the cool moss of the seven hillocks—and the comment in the earlier version that each heap was 'like a tall maid's grave' helps us to feel that the fishers' beliefs are within the realm of genuine superstition. If we cannot share their belief in fairies we can at least understand their response to those grave-like objects which seem to tell their own story. And if help were needed in appreciating this point we might turn to an entry in one of Coleridge's Notebooks:

Something more than a furlong from the Force, not ten yards from the beck, on the hill 8 heaps of moss, ranged thus [he gives a diagram] each an exact grave, each in the descent somewhat longer than the one higher up, the first four feet in length, the lowest 8½ feet.²

One would be inclined to think that this prompted the lines in 'The Solitude of Binnorie', but the poem was written by 17 August and the description in the Notebook belongs to an evening about ten days later.³ Nor need we infer that the lines were an early addition or amendment following the Notebook entry, since the seven moss-covered mounds come from 'Die sieben Hügel' and 'The Thorn' offers a precedent for their strikingly grave-like appearance. Nevertheless, there may be an instance here of the relatedness of Coleridge's ideas and Wordsworth's, with the reminiscence on this occasion on Coleridge's part, for 'The Solitude of Binnorie' was likely to be fresh in his mind when he made this particular observation in his Notebook. The entry, however, does nothing to explain why Wordsworth, or Coleridge, should wish to alter this feature of the story of the seven sisters—rather the reverse since it seems to confirm the impact of the original lines. The superstition that the sisters are buried on the seven little islands makes the whole idea seem more remote and gives a more deliberately fanciful conclusion to the poem.

¹ *P.M.L.A.*, lxxiv (1959), 85–97.

² *Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. K. Coburn (London, 1957), i. 793 5½-37.

³ Coleridge dates this entry 'August 27', but it seems to relate to 29 Aug.

THE SOLITUDE OF BINNORIE, OR THE SEVEN DAUGHTERS OF LORD
ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, A POEM

SEVEN daughters had Lord ARCHIBALD
All children of one mother:
I could not say, in one short day,
What love they bore each other!
Seven lilies in one garland wrought,
Together did they dwell; 5
But he, bold Knight as ever fought,
Of those fair daughters took no thought,
He lov'd the wars so well.
Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
The solitude of Binnorie.

Fresh blows the wind from out the west,
And from the shores of Erin,
Across the wave, a rover brave,
To Binnorie is steering. 15
Right onward to the Scottish strand
The gallant ship is borne:
The warriors leap upon the sand,
And, hark! the leader of the band
Hath blown his bugle horn!
Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
The solitude of Binnorie.

Close by a grotto of their own,
The Seven, in rural fashion,
Beneath a tree were sitting, free
From all unquiet passion; 25
But now, upstarting with affright,
At noise of man and steed,
Away they fly to left, to right—
Of your fair household, Father Knight,
Methinks you take small heed!
Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
The solitude of Binnorie.

Away the seven fair CAMPBELLS fly;
And, over hill and hollow, 35
With menace proud, and insult loud,
The youthful rovers follow.
Cried they, your father loves to roam—
Enough for him to find
The empty house, when he comes home! 40

For us your yellow ringlets comb,
 For us be fair and kind!
 Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
 The solitude of Binnorie.

Some close behind, some side by side,
 Like clouds in stormy weather;
 They run, and cry—nay, let us die,
 And let us die together!

A lake was near, its shores were deep,
 Its margin smooth and green;
 The damsels ran like mountain sheep,
 And in together did they leap,
 Nor ever more were seen!
 Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
 The solitude of Binnorie.

The stream that flows out of the lake,
 As down the rock it ambles,
 Doth make a moan o'er moss and stone,
 For those seven lovely CAMPBELLS!

Each like a tall maid's grave, there are
 Seven mossy heaps hard by;
 The fishers say, those sisters fair
 By faeries were all buried there,
 And there together lie!
 Sing mournfully, oh! mournfully,
 The solitude of Binnorie.¹

¹ Since this article was written, the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* ('William Wordsworth Issue' (lxiv), 1960, 209-37) has printed a debate between S. M. Parrish and D. V Erdman on the authorship of 'The Mad Monk'. In this debate, which mainly concerns matter outside the scope of the present article, one or two inferences are drawn that differ from my own, but, all things considered, they do not persuade me to adopt them. I am most grateful for the help given me by Professor Geoffrey Tillotson in preparing this paper, and for comment offered by Professor Parrish and Mrs. Barbara Hardy.

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S 'THE STRAYED REVELLER'

By LEON A. GOTTFRIED

In 1849 a young, unknown poet published semi-anonymously his first volume of verse. The poet was Matthew Arnold, the volume was *The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems*. By A. Along with verses which in their manner, if not their matter, were characteristic of the earnest moralizing of much Victorian poetry, there were to be found in this volume some poems based on dreams, on obscure bits of Oriental history, and on an imaginative reworking of well-known myths. Many readers, including members of Arnold's own family, found some or all of these performances obscure, puzzling, or remote from the serious concerns of contemporary reality. And yet, even in the most puzzling and *recherché* of these first poems, I believe that the moralist is not far to seek. Now a good deal—possibly too much—has been made of the various 'conflicts', 'ambivalences', and 'dichotomies' in Arnold's mind and soul. In particular, I believe that it has been altogether too easy, and misleading, to divide Arnold into 'artist' and 'moralist', corresponding to the early Arnold and the later. For it is clear from his early letters to Arthur Hugh Clough, and those to his sister in the slim volume of *Unpublished Letters*,¹ how serious were his moral preoccupations in his thinking about poetry, how tinged with social purpose were his remarks even on diction, imagery, and organization. From the very beginning, as far as we can see, Arnold was deeply concerned with problems of the viability of the spirit and imagination in a world of utilitarian standards of human behaviour and scientific or pseudo-scientific standards of thought. More precisely, we find dominant among Arnold's preoccupations, at whatever period we take him, the faith that modern man can find his salvation, which for Arnold meant wholeness and harmony, only through the agency of poetry. His late, no doubt extravagant, claims are well known. But to read even his earliest poetry properly we must be aware that behind it lay a critical effort, and behind that, a moral passion.

However, stratifying these elements as I have just done suggests that Arnold was ostensibly didactic in his poetic intentions, and hence falsifies. For it was not only by means of what he could say in his poetry, but actually and

¹ *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, ed. H. F. Lowry (London and New York, 1932), hereafter referred to as *Letters to Clough*; *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold*, ed. A. Whitridge (New Haven and New York, 1922), hereafter referred to as *Unpublished Letters*.

primarily in the nature of that poetry that he hoped as a young man to do his work. As with Eliot or Pound in our time, as with his master Wordsworth before him, the immediate problem he set himself was to 'purify the dialect of the tribe'. It was only thus that he could be what he told his sister he aspired to be, 'a reformer in poetical matters'.¹ Furthermore, it was only through a massive general effort of this kind that modern English poetry could become, as he hoped it might, a true 'magister vitae', taking its rightful place as a spiritual discipline transcending science.² That Arnold succeeded in achieving this great goal, even to the relative degree that Wordsworth succeeded, is scarcely to be maintained. But our recognition of such a purpose may enable us to unify some of the Arnoldian dualisms, and to read some of his earlier poems with fuller, if still somewhat tentative, understanding.

For my example I have chosen to discuss 'The Strayed Reveller', a poem which has received little close attention although Arnold thought it important enough to give it the place of honour in his first volume. It deals with the nature of the poet, embodying a blend of two themes common in nineteenth-century romanticism: the apotheosis of the artist (what the gods see 'The wise bards also | Behold and sing', 208-9), and the agony of the artist ('But oh, what labour!' cries the reveller-poet to Ulysses, the man of action, 'O prince, what pain!' 210-11). The agony stems from the suffering the poet must share with his subjects:

—such a price
The Gods exact for song:
To become what we sing. (232-4)

Nevertheless, the joy of such a communion is so intense that the strayed youth, intoxicated with the Circean wine of the imagination, implores the 'wild, thronging train . . . of eddying forms' to sweep faster, faster through his soul. For the moment the vision is overpowering in its profusion. The pain is yet to come, no doubt when the Dionysiac reveller (in the story he is a worshipper of Iacchus) begins to bring some Apollonian order into his ecstatic visions and seeks to mould meaning out of the chaos of experience.

Surely when Arnold wrote the speeches of the Youth, speeches which Lionel Trilling has aptly characterized as 'an almost barbaric paean to the whole of life, even to pain', he must have had in mind such a poet as Keats, whose letters he had found so agitating.³ Arnold observed to Clough in a letter of this period that Keats was 'consumed' by the desire for 'movement and fulness', the same desire chanted by the intoxicated reveller.⁴

¹ *Unpublished Letters*, p. 15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 96.

³ *Letters to Clough*, p. 124.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

The poem as a whole, however, remains obscure. A main problem is that, as one of Arnold's most 'romantic' poems, 'The Strayed Reveller' seems to violate just those critical principles which he was straining to develop at the time he was composing it, principles to be enunciated more fully in the Preface of 1853. Thus although the poem is written in dramatic form, its central action is slight and heavily overlaid with decoration. Descriptive passages which are supposed to represent examples of the variety of human existence become, because of their length and sensuous elaboration, digressive ornaments:

Of silk-bales and balsam-drops,
Of gold and ivory,
Of turquoise-earth and amethyst,
Jasper and chalcedony,
And milk-barr'd onyx stones, (193-7)

reminiscent of Keats's 'spiced dainties, every one, | From silken Samarcand to cedar'd Lebanon', but less organic. Furthermore, the philosophy of poetry it expresses, one of the infinite expansion of the self through vicarious experience, is closer to Keats's 'negative capability' than to Arnold's view of poetry as making things. Indeed, the reveller comes perilously close to describing poetry as 'a true allegory of the state of one's own mind in a representative history', the view Arnold so sternly reproved in his 1853 Preface. For if the poet becomes what he sings, then he is singing himself in allegorical representation.

Surely it is insufficient to put aside the problems raised by this poem by appealing to Arnold's notorious 'duality', without first attempting other means of clarification. Arnold had expressed himself in 1847 as being fatigued by Tennyson's 'dawdling' with the 'painted shell' of the universe.¹ Could he, as a self-styled 'reformer in poetical matters', give as the title poem of his first volume of poetry a work so seemingly ill-designed to illustrate his principles of reform, so seemingly in the very style of the poets he lumped together contemptuously as 'Keats Tennyson et id genus omne'?²

Rather, I am inclined to take as a working hypothesis the premiss that Arnold knew what he was about, and that what he was about may be discerned if we accept the possibility that in 'The Strayed Reveller' he was

¹ *Letters to Clough*, p. 63.

² *Ibid.*, p. 97. The allusion to Horace (characteristically misquoted) makes clear just how contemptuous he was:

Ambubiarum collegia, pharmacopolea,
Mendici, mimae, balatrones, hoc genus omne.

In the English of D. B. Wyndham Lewis: 'The community of doxies, quacks, beggars, mummers, rascals, and all their kind.' Horace, *Satires*, i. 2.

using the indirect means of irony and allegory in place of that 'thinking aloud' in verse to which he objected. First, if the poem is to be taken as allegory, the title ought to be carefully considered. It would appear from this point of view that the word *strayed* must convey more meaning than its literal signification in the slender fable of the poem. Moreover, once we have admitted the metaphorical, and pejorative, connotation of *strayed*, Arnold's choice of Circe as the presiding goddess of the reveller's poetic inebriation becomes explicable. Trilling has pointed out that 'This is not the Circe of Homer, for the wine effects no swinish transmogrification; it is the wine of vision and ecstatic madness. . . .'¹ But we may then ask why Arnold chose to use the Circe legend at all, as it was certain to call up a host of undesired associations. The point, it seems to me, is that although this is a modern Circe, refined, subtilized, even spiritualized, she remains essentially the dangerous seducer and debaucher of old. This would be in keeping with Arnold's technique in another poem when he changed Homer's sirens to 'The New Sirens', who are nevertheless, as Arnold explained to Clough, no less dangerous than the old merely because they have become representations of romantic love instead of fierce sensuality.²

The reveller, then, a youthful poet driven by his naturally ardent nature and hungering for experience, goes astray and willingly submits to the Circean potion. That her influence is sinister is clear from the accusing questions of Ulysses and Circe's insistence that she did not lead the youth astray, but that he came of his own volition. Under the influence of the 'red, creaming liquor', his brain grows giddy:

Who can stand still?
Ye fade, ye swim, ye waver before me—
The cup again! (289–91)

Through his fiery imagination surges a bright procession of visions, beautiful, but also 'wild', 'thronging', and 'eddying'. So long as he remains astray, drunk with variety and sensation, he can 'Without pain, without labour' (274) have these visions of intense but disordered beauty. It is the 'wise bards', not drunk on Circean wine, who pay for their visions and insight with labour and pain (207–11). But the romantic sensationalist, lacking what Arnold called in a letter 'an idea of the world' and drunk with superficial beauty and variety, finds himself, to quote from the same letter, 'prevailed over by the world's multitudinousness'. Arnold, no doubt with Goethe in mind as a model, complained frequently in his letters of 1847–8 of the pain but also the necessity of dealing with the

¹ Matthew Arnold (New York, 1949), p. 97.

² Arnold underlined the word *new* in writing to Clough about 'The New Sirens', *Letters to Clough*, pp. 105–7. In this poem the Siren's voice almost quotes Keats: 'Judgement shifts, convictions go; . . . Only, what we feel we know.'

variety of life in a meaningful manner: 'For me', he wrote, 'you may often hear my sinews cracking under the effort to unite matter.' Even if possessed of the greatest genius, the genius of a Keats, what Arnold called a 'mere recorder of existence' cannot produce 'the truly living and moving'.¹ At the end of the poem, the reveller, as far astray as at the beginning, merely cries out for more wine.

If the reveller is strayed, then, in the sense that I have been suggesting, his lyric speeches must be approached with some caution as dramatic utterances. These speeches are indeed rich in description, finely evocative, but they are not unified, they reveal no particular sense of subordination of parts to whole. Though classic in diction, they are the sort of poems a young poet under the influence of Keats and 'dawdling with the painted shell' of the universe would make. Like Keats—and by 'Keats' I mean Arnold's image of Keats—the strayed reveller passionately desires 'movement and fulness', although he seems partly to realize that something more is needed, that great art cannot be all pleasure, all intoxication. The reveller sees the act of creation as one of self-enlargement through vicarious participation—poets become what they sing—and although this may be painful it is a necessary price for partaking of the intense joy of vision, if, at any rate, the vision is to reach fruition, if the bard is to become 'wise' rather than 'strayed'. Arnold seems to have misunderstood Keats's 'negative capability' as a surrender to the flux of phenomena, and hence morally dangerous. He failed to perceive that Keats, not only as a man (as Arnold argued in his late essay on Keats) but also as a poet, was no mere sensation seeker, that he, like Arnold, had struggled for a poetic mastery of experience and could not rest content to be its slave. Still, in its time, Arnold's reading of Keats had some justification, for he was right in seeing that the influence of Keats in the middle of the century was not a good one. Moreover, it was destined to become worse before it got better. Arnold's early recognition of this seems almost prophetic of the sensationalism of Rossetti and Wilde and the cult of 'beauty', flying the banner of Keats. Arnold himself, like the reveller, and no doubt like most young poets, was powerfully attracted, as he confessed to Clough, by Circe's wine of sensation.² The reveller, unlike Arnold, but like the contemporaries to whose practice he objected, could not resist the attraction. It is interesting to contrast 'The Strayed Reveller' with 'Resignation', a poem of the same period: in the latter Arnold uses the first person rather than the dramatic method, and there the speaker is at considerable pains to controvert the reveller's idea of poetry as vicarious experience; instead he there argues for an aesthetic of detachment. Both because he uses direct utterance in 'Resignation', and because he quotes from that poem in arguing

¹ Letters to Clough, pp. 65, 97.

² Ibid., p. 97.

an aesthetic point with Clough,¹ it is reasonable to assume that the views Arnold expressed there are far more directly representative of his own ideas than the wild and whirling lyrics of the drunken reveller.

Certainly my interpretation may not account for all the difficulties in 'The Strayed Reveller', but I believe that the approach adumbrated here has the advantage of accounting for certain rather important matters. First, it provides for a more than literal interpretation of the title. Second, it explains the use and conception of Circe. Third, and most significant, it may solve the rather mystifying question of why the young poetical reformer should have chosen what appears to be one of his most romantic efforts as the title piece of his first volume. (And it is worth observing, as a curious testimony to Arnold's reputation for inconsistency, that this question itself has never been asked.) No reader of the poem, however, can for a moment believe that Arnold's intention was merely parodic. Loving care was lavished upon it, and the descriptions of the floating melon-beds of Cashmeer or of the strange method of crossing the Oxus, in addition to indulging Arnold's taste for Orientalism, are as beautiful as he knew how to make them, for the poem would fail even as allegory if they were not. Furthermore, the parallels with the poetry of Keats and his imitators are primarily to be found in overall design, not so much in the style itself.² Arnold deplored excesses in the imagery of the Elizabethans and their latter-day imitators, Keats, Shelley, Tennyson, and other, lesser lights. 'The Strayed Reveller' is a genuine *tour de force* of 'Greek radiance', rich and exquisitely clear in its realization of objects but entirely free, as earlier

¹ *Letters to Clough*, p. 99.

² However, at least two passages seem to be conscious allusions to Keats's 'Ode on a Grecian Urn'. In the first, Ulysses questions Circe about the identity of the mysterious youth:

What youth, Goddess,—what guest
Of Gods or mortals? (94–95)

This may be compared with Keats's

What men or gods are these? What maidens loth?
What mad pursuit?

In the second, Ulysses is again the speaker. He is dilating on the social usefulness of the 'divine bard, | By age taught many things', who would delight 'The chiefs and people' with his songs

Of Gods and Heroes,
Of war and arts,
And peopled cities,
Inland, or built
By the grey sea. (118–28)

This is surely reminiscent of Keats's famous

What little town by river or sea shore,
Or mountain-built with peaceful citadel. . .

critics have observed, of figures of speech.¹ In Arnold's avoidance of the striking metaphor and the brilliant epithet, we may see the reformer at work. It is as though he were saying, 'Here is the poetry of multitudinousness such as, under the influence of Keats, is now altogether too much in fashion. I can write it too, and with greater purity. But its source is not the wine that makes us "nobly wild, not mad"; it is the liquor of Circe the seductress.' Arnold, both attracted and repelled by the wine of the sensuous, the passionate, the varied, the ornate, has created in 'The Strayed Reveller' not only a dramatic representation of certain romantic attitudes toward art and the self, but also has implied in the structure and diction of the poem a subtle allegorical critique of them.

¹ See Emery Neff, *A Revolution in European Poetry 1660-1900* (New York, 1940), p. 151, and Trilling, p. 144.

NOTES

EDWARD DAUNCE AND THE UNFORTUNATE TRAVELLER

IN 1590 there appeared a short essay called *A Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State*.¹ The dedication to Queen Elizabeth is signed by Edward Daunce; the address to the noble and virtuous reader, which follows, is signed E. D. Gent. Nothing is known of Daunce except that he wrote *A Briefe Discourse Dialoguewise* (1590). On internal evidence *The Prayse of Nothing* (1585) has also been attributed to him.²

On the second page of *A Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State* Daunce states plainly the object of his work: '... I haue thought good for the benefit of her Maiesties subiectes, (some of them having vaine imaginacions of the Spaniards excellent giftes and greatnesse) to drawe the lineaments of their Empire and good nature, by which it may appear howe monstruous the proportion of both is, which they would should seeme most exquisit and comely to all men.' In the rest of the *Discourse*, which is designed to encourage his countrymen to despise the Spanish as enemies, he describes the decadence of the Spanish character, illustrating his account with examples of the conduct of individual Spaniards, and offering where he can an explanation of the origins of Spanish depravity.

For example, having observed that the Spaniards are aggressive, boastful, unfruitful, poor, dishonest, cruel, unconstitutional, and vulgar, Daunce accounts for this unattractive combination of national characteristics by describing the mixed blood of the Spanish people. 'The naturall *Spaniard*, being as a simple, is of a confuse and beastly conceit, of diet miserable and furious, nourished to increase those humours in scarsitie: but mixed with the *Gothes* and *Vandals*, giuen to theeuery and drunkennes: mingled with the *Mores* cruell and full of trecherie: and consequently, tasting of euerie one, a spring of all filthinesse' (p. 36). Shortly before this Daunce has cited as confirmation of the barbarian influences on Spain the names of the provinces. For example, Catalonia was originally Gottalania, from the Goths and the Alani, while the Vandals gave its name to Vandaluzia.

¹ A BRIEFE | DISCOURSE OF THE | SPANISH STATE, WITH | A Dialogue annexed intituled | PHILO-BASILIS. | (Device) | AT LONDON, | Imprinted by Richard Field dwelling in the | Blache-Fries neere Ludgate. | 1590. Pollard and Redgrave record copies in the Bodleian, in the Library of Lincoln Cathedral, and in the library of Sir R. L. Harmsworth. There is also a copy in the British Museum.

² See Ralph M. Sargent, 'The Authorship of *The Praise of Nothing*', *The Library*, xii (1932), 322-31.

He concludes by assuring his readers that the prosperity of Spain is in decline.

The most interesting parts of Daunce's work are those in which he gives examples of the atrocious behaviour of Spaniards; at many points he mentions conduct similar to that which Nashe in *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) ascribes to the Italians. Daunce usually writes in more general terms than Nashe, but the vices and crimes he describes are the same—murder, torture, furious beastliness, and the massacring of innocent people. His descriptions of torture have not the fascinated elaboration of Nashe's, but they are similar in detail. For example, he says that the Spaniards ill-treated their Indian servants 'yealding them (their hands and feet being bound to a crosse pale) in sted of their supper, many stripes with corde, or the sinnewes of a Buphal; dropping on them either boylng pitch or oile: and after washing them with salt water they would lay them so long upon a table, as they imagined those wretches might beare the paine' (p. 21).

Nashe's account of the execution of Zadoc (McKerrow, ii. 315)¹ may have been influenced by this.² One of the most vivid of Daunce's individual examples is his account (p. 15) of the ravishing of a lady of Flanders in the presence of her husband. Nashe describes a similar incident in his story of the chaste matron Heraclide (McKerrow, ii. 287–95).

Daunce maintains that the Spaniards are cruel not only to subject peoples but to each other, and in illustration of this relates the story which provides the closest parallel with Nashe.

... I wil cite one example, as it was reported to me at Venice 1569. by a Gentleman of the house of Mantua, of great credite: ... The manner thereof was, as he said, in this sort. One of these monsters meeting his enimie vnarmed, threatned to kill him if he denied not God, his power, and essentiall properties, vz. his mercy, sufferance, &c. the which when the other desiring life, pronounced with great horror, kneeling upon his knees: the Brano³ cried out, nowe will I kill thy bodie and soule, and at that instant thrust him through with his Rapier. (p. 24)

Compare this passage with Cutwolfe's account at the end of *The Unfortunate Traveller* of his revenge on Esdras (McKerrow, ii. 320–6).

¹ References to Nashe are to the edition in five volumes by R. B. McKerrow (1904–10). The edition with supplement (1958) retains the original page numbers.

² It must, however, be remembered that accounts of similar barbarities were available to both Daunce and Nashe in the histories of the Spanish conquest of the New World, as for instance Bartholomew de las Casas, *A briefe Narration of the destruction of the Indies by the Spaniards* (1542; translated 1583).

³ Brano, clearly for Brauo, occurs in the British Museum, Bodleian, and Lincoln Cathedral Library copies. Misprints are frequent in the work. (For the information about the Lincoln copy I am indebted to Dr. P. Swinbank.)

Having come upon Esdras unarmed Cutwolfe listened implacably to his pleas for a brief respite to purify his spirit.

With my selfe I deuided how to plague him double for his base minde: my thoughtes traueld in quest of some notable newe Italionisme, whose murderous platforme might not onely extend on his bodie, but his soul also. The ground worke of it was this: . . . First and formost, he should renounce God and his laws, and vterly disclaime the whole title or interest he had in anie couenant of saluation. Next, he should curse him to his face, as Job was willed by his wife, and write an absolute firme obligation of his soule to the deuell, without condition or exception. Thirdly and lastly, (hauing done this,) hee shoulde pray to God feruently neuer to haue mercie vpon him, or pardon him.

Esdras eagerly complied with these conditions. ‘. . . I made no more ado, but shot him full into the throat with my pistoll: no more spake he after; so did I shoot him that he might neuer speake after, or repent him.’ On this passage, McKerrow has the note: ‘The story of the ‘notable newe Italionisme’ of getting a man to renounce God in order to save his life and then immediately killing him is evidently related to that told in Heywood’s *Γυναικεῖον*, 1624, p. 400, of a Milanese gentleman, but I have not traced the source.’

The desire for revenge on the soul as well as on the body is, of course, put forward by Hamlet as a reason for not killing Claudius at his prayers, and is thereafter found with some frequency in dramatic works.¹ In the absence of any evidence for an earlier source which might be common to both it is reasonable to assume that Nashe had the story from Daunce. If so, it is possible that when he drew his picture of Italy in the 1530’s as ‘the sporting place of murther’ he had in mind not only the Elizabethan reputation of Italy as the home of ‘false hearted Machiuillions’ but also the distorted accounts of Spanish life which were current in works of propaganda such as *A Briefe Discourse*.

PHILIP DREW

NOTES ON SWIFT AND JOHNSON

Swift and Granville

SWIFT’S *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift* (written in 1731/2) begin with a translation of a maxim by La Rochefoucauld. But the version given in the poem differs from the maxim as it was printed, and translated, on the title-

¹ Steevens cites parallels from *The White Devil*, *The Honest Lawyer*, the third of Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Four Plays in One*, and Lewis Machin’s *The Dumb Knight* (1633).

page: 'Dans l'adversité de nos meilleurs amis nous trouvons quelque chose, qui ne nous déplaist pas.' Swift's verse runs:

In all Distresses of our Friends
We first consult our private Ends,
While Nature kindly bent to ease us,
Points out some Circumstance to please us.¹

In the second couplet it is only *please* which derives directly from La Rochefoucauld; and this is apparently because Swift has created the couplet from a reminiscence of a song by George Granville:

Cloe's the Wonder of her Sex,
'Tis well her Heart is tender,
How might such killing Eyes perplex
With Virtue to defend her.

But Nature, merciful and kind,
Not bent to vex, but please us,
Has to her boundless Beauty joyn'd
A boundless Will to ease us.

(The History of Adolphus, 1691, p. 48)

Swift's couplet takes from Granville's second stanza (and not from La Rochefoucauld) *Nature, kind, bent*, and the rhyme *ease us | please us*. What would otherwise have to be thought of simply as loose translation is in fact a literary reminiscence.

Swift and Johnson

Writing on *The Vanity of Human Wishes* in *R.E.S.*, n.s. vi (1955), 162 n., Mr. Henry Gifford says that 'the physical force of Johnson's imagery is well illustrated by his five uses of the verb *crowd* in this poem'. He quotes as one example l. 73: 'Unnumber'd suppliants crowd Preferment's gate.' Perhaps Mr. Gifford's point needs to be slightly adapted in order to meet the fact that Johnson's line is borrowed from Swift: 'They crowd about Preferment's Gate.'² But the omission by Johnson of *about* has the effect of turning *crowd* from an intransitive to a transitive verb, and so increases the energy of the line. It still illustrates Mr. Gifford's contention, but perhaps rather obliquely.

CHRISTOPHER RICKS

¹ *Poems*, ed. H. Williams (2nd edn., London, 1958), ii. 553-4.

² 'To Doctor Delany', 1730; *Poems*, ii. 503. The borrowing is not mentioned by the Oxford editors of Johnson's poems.

REVIEWS

The Metre of Beowulf. By A. J. BLISS. Pp. x + 166. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.
25s. net.

Mr. Bliss here re-examines Sievers's findings on Old English metre and their statistical basis. He is led to this exacting performance partly because after more than seventy years a re-examination of so fundamentally influential a work seemed very much due, and partly because Sievers's 'bahnbrechendes Werk' had seemed to have been largely 'by-passed' as a result of the writings of Leonard and Heusler, and even more by the now dominating work of J. C. Pope. Having found that his re-examination resulted in 'a triumphant vindication of Sievers', the author of this volume went on to explore what might be attained by a further study along lines suggested by Sievers's methods. He concludes his final chapter 'Towards an Interpretation' with these words:

It is to be hoped, however, that even this brief sketch will be sufficient to show that our understanding of Old English verse is likely to be considerably increased by a more intensive and detailed study of actual metrical forms. There is no profit to be found in arguing in a vacuum, without a sound basis of statistical information. Despite an obligatory condensation resulting at times in a terseness which may lead to obscurity or the appearance of dogmatism (as is gracefully acknowledged in the preface), the book admirably carries out this modest aim. The statistical tables alone, which document the whole, would in themselves make the book rewarding and permanently valuable. These tables, which form an appendix, not only cover very fully the whole scansion of *Beowulf*, but also all the 'hypermetric' lines in the OE. *corpus poeticum*. In these statistics, as explained in the chapter on Classification, the author finds it necessary in the interest of 'simplicity and consistency' to modify Sievers's scheme by the omission of the recording of 'resolutions', and by the ignoring of the distinction between 'secondary' and 'tertiary' stress (pp. 82-83).

Almost all will agree that Sievers's statistical work remains basic and fundamental. It is in the degree of its sufficiency for the full appreciation and recording of OE. metre that Mr. Bliss would vindicate and even further exploit him against the musical and rhythmic replacements implied in the work of Professor Pope and his more immediate predecessors. Sievers himself in later years recognized his too merely syllabic approach as inadequate; but the very solipsistic nature of his *Schallanalyse* has tended to prevent due recognition of the master's later and more humane attitude towards OE. metre.¹ Leonard, being himself a poet, felt the need to relate OE. poetry to the time-attitudes of modern music; Heusler followed him with more scientific and systematic attention to the apparent needs of rhythmic tempo; and Pope, recognizing the necessity of assuming some kind of harp accompaniment to the recitation (as Sievers and

¹ Cf. his *Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse* (Heidelberg, 1924), and 'Cædmon und Genesis' in *Britannica, Festschrift für Max Förster* (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 57-85.

Heusler, who assumed no musical accompaniment in historic times, had not done), made the 'harp-substitutions' an integral part of his system of OE. metrics by requiring the harp to indicate the 'rests' which he assumed in his scansion in order to equate the methods of OE. traditional *scopas* to those assumed for modern music.¹ Mr. Bliss, finding Sievers much undervalued owing to the tendency to insist on musical tempo illustrated especially by Pope in recent years, seeks to show that there is no valid reason for the assumption made tacitly by the 'music-masters' that OE. poetry must of necessity have conformed to the 'isochronous' practices associated with Western European music of modern times. He finds that much of the Pope school of metrics leads to artificial results and distortions in scansion; further, that though Sievers was inadequate and limited in his earlier and now standardized attitude to rhythm, his methods were basically right because resting on sheer factual evidence, and that his pioneer lines of thought may be pursued with sounder results and prospects than the music-dominated metrics of Pope which in many ways lead to the incredibly unnatural.

The Sutton Hoo discoveries, with the recording of the reconstructed harp,² should give a new impetus to the discussion of the relation of the metre of *Beowulf* to the harp. This matter is only touched upon to be dismissed as hopeless in this book (p. 107).

The question of the musical elements in OE. metre is inevitably, in the absence of scientific knowledge, subjective. We do not know whether *Beowulf* was recited without accompaniment, sung to the harp, or chanted more in the traditional manner associated with survivals like the Russian *bylina*. But the insistence of Pope on isochronous musical time in all scansion may make his *Beowulf* notation with modern musical symbols seem almost to suggest an unconscious subservience to the metronome. In many ballad survivals, both in Europe and America, it is the *phrase* that is related to the musical accompaniment rather than any isochronic balancing of stresses and rests in 4/8 time: so that the measures are of necessity often irregular and unequal from the point of view of our musical tempo. An assumption of chanting in unequal phrases, often of formulaic type, would not be inconsistent with the basic five-type system of Sievers. On the other hand, it could do away with the frequent objection to Pope's system that it is too rigidly metronomic; for his scansion could still be used without isochronicity. The chapter on 'The Metrics of *Beowulf*' in Dr. Nist's recent book *The Structure and Texture of Beowulf* puts this point of view in modification of the Pope method of scansion particularly well; and indeed the whole of the second part of the work, 'The Texture of *Beowulf*', merits close attention.³

¹ All references to significant writings on OE. metre up to 1941 will be found in J. C. Pope's *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (New Haven, 1942).

² Cf. J. B. Bessinger, 'Beowulf and the Harp at Sutton Hoo', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, xxvii (1958), 148–68, and C. L. Wrenn, 'Sutton Hoo and Beowulf', *Mélanges de Linguistique et de Philologie Fernand Mossé in Memoriam* (Paris, 1959), pp. 495–507. The discovery of fragments of an apparently comparable harp in an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Taplow has not yet been described.

³ John A. Nist, *The Structure and Texture of Beowulf* (São Paulo, 1959).

Mr. Bliss, too, realizes the importance of phrasing, and he uses it in his argument against the isochronic approach of Pope (p. 109). Taking the classical principles of Sievers and his five types, then, as still the best foundation for the presentation of OE. metre, he recognizes Sievers's weaknesses and limitation, particularly in the matter of the varied position of the caesura and the related natural flexibility of actual stress which had failed to receive proper recognition in the traditional Sievers scansion. He remedies these drawbacks by adjustments in the symbolic presentation of the five types, though this may seem to make the notation more complex. Nothing new is claimed for this re-presentation of the traditional Sievers scansion, save that it does justify it as the most accurate and efficient method yet found, and that in the process of re-examination several valuable points which had of late been ignored or forgotten by metrists are once more given their proper significance. Among these latter are the connexion between anacrusis and alliteration, the varying position of the caesura within some of the separate types, and some distinctions between the metre of 'gnomic' verse and that of epic. Most students will approve the following sentences from the introduction:

It must be admitted that an adequate interpretation of the Old English metrical forms is still to seek. . . . The purpose of this study is to provide a more accurate and complete classification of the Old English metrical types, as a basis for a fresh interpretation. (pp. 2-3)

A few points of detail may now be mentioned. In the introduction, the name of J. Schipper and his *Englische Metrik* should have had honourable mention. In chapter 2, which explains the distinction between 'Normal' and 'Heavy' verses, the work of H. Kuhn on *Satzteile* and his 'law of particles' is simplified, but in so doing its results seem to be expressed in a somewhat confusing manner.¹ The defining chapters on stress and quantity, resolution, the caesura, and anacrusis, which lead up to the main body of the work on Sievers's five types, are admirably clear, concise, and effective. The emendation of *Beowulf* from 2252a *gesawon seledream* to *secca seledream*, which on p. 42 is found oddly 'palaeographically satisfactory', is rightly reconsidered in an addendum on p. 166. The usual reading of *Beowulf* 2673a (p. 77) as the metrically implausible *bord wið rond* should be corrected by moving *bord* from the line above and taking *for* as a verb, so that 2672b-3a read:

Ligyðum for.
Born bord wið rond.

This discovery of Pope (p. 320) was incorporated by Dobbie in his *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* edition. On p. 105 the first footnote should read *Hickes* for *Hearne* as the transcriber of *The Fight at Finnsburgh*. In an appendix, besides the immensely useful statistical tables, there is new material of interest in sections on 'Secondary and Tertiary Stress' and on 'Vocalic Endings in Old English'.

Inevitably, in so deliberately condensed a work, there must be aspects of OE. metre which one would have wished treated. Such is the stylistic significance

¹ 'Wortstellung und Wortbetonung im Altgermanischen', *Paul und Braunes Beiträge*, lvii (1933), 1-109.

of the *schwellverse* or 'hypermetric' lines (on which there is a very stimulating chapter), or the 'echo-words' on which Dr. Beaty sought to stir up interest.¹ But the extreme compression which has been forced on the author by external factors, which makes this book suffer stylistically, must also probably be held responsible for its omissions. Those who need a more readable and loosely written account of OE. metre set in its wider background of Germanic tradition and later developments will find what they need in Professor Lehmann's agreeable pages.² But Lehmann too accepts the Sievers metric. What Mr. Bliss has done is to vindicate, clarify, and supplement the position of the classical Sievers, while at the same time adding much of his own thinking without making large claims to finality or completeness. For the facts alone which it brings again to light this book will remain of permanent value.

C. L. WRENN

The Art of Beowulf. By ARTHUR GILCHRIST BRODEUR. Pp. xii+284. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1959. 34s. net.

Professor Brodeur is a practised exponent of *Beowulf*, and everyone interested in the poem can learn much from his book. Its chief strength is in the study of verbal devices, which are skilfully examined in terms of content and of structure. The perceptive and stimulating chapter on diction is supported by an appendix on the varieties of poetic appellation, in which the typical periphrases of Old English poetry are analysed by comparison with the theory and practice of skaldic poetry, where such processes reached their ultimate elaboration. This clear formulation of the Old English 'kenning' is both original and valuable. One might object that the interpretation of *garbeam* as 'spear-tree', i.e. warrior, is strained, since the whole phrase *garbeames feng* in *Exodus* 246 is more naturally taken as 'the stroke of the spear-shaft'. Mention should have been made of Hertha Marquardt's *Die altenglischen Kenningar* (Halle, 1938), the only full conspectus of the material.

In the following chapter, on variation, the author is able to deploy his wide experience and his gift of exposition to the full. Methods of amplification and progression are well illustrated, here and in Appendix C. There is a firm grip on the essentials of style; notice the sober discussion of *ealuscerwen* (p. 59).

By contrast, Mr. Brodeur's views on the subject-matter of the poem and its design are often unconvincing. Personal emotion is overstressed; as when Beowulf is said to begin his long monologue (2426–509) 'with a tender acknowledgment of Hrethel's loving care', and when it is later suggested (p. 87) that here Beowulf expresses his resolve to face the dragon as 'a tribute to Hygelac's memory'. For the theme of this recapitulation, cast in the form of Beowulf's life-history, is the progressive extinction of the Geatish royal house. Representation of great issues in terms of personal experience is a standard convention of heroic poetry,

¹ John O. Beaty, 'The Echo-word in *Beowulf* with a Note on The Finnsburg Fragment', *P.L.M.A.*, xl ix (1934), 367–73.

² W. P. Lehmann, *The Development of Germanic Verse Form* (Austin, 1956).

and the poet's enrichment of the surface should not be allowed to obscure the dominant meaning. Mr. Brodeur phrases much of his comment in outright dramatic terms: 'the first act of the drama', 'acted out upon the stage', a speech that 'ends with a kind of shudder'. By insisting on a realistic interpretation, he loses sight of the demands of the heroic situation. Hygelac holds a special position as overlord of the hero, the proper object of his loyal devotion. This relationship is used to give 'warmth and depth to the hero's personality'; but to say that Beowulf mentions Hygelac 'tenderly and with deep affection' in six of his speeches is a harmful exaggeration. Unferth appears as the typical detractor whose changing attitude charts the progress of the hero's fame. Yet Mr. Brodeur argues that he must be intended as a major character, 'playing a part of considerable importance to the Danes after Beowulf's departure'. The poet has indicated Unferth's part as mischief-maker between Hrothgar and Hrothulf clearly and briefly (1165-8). He has economically assigned this function to the personage who represents initial opposition to Beowulf at the Danish court. The dramatic fallacy that prompts reconstruction in depth similarly leads to a strange estimate of Hygelac's function in the plot. It is suggested that Geatish support for Hrethric was promised, but could not be given after Hygelac had fallen; and therefore the first mention of this event (1202-14) is designed to connect it with the ruin of Hrothgar's line. One might rather take this allusion as a presage of the scenes and events of Beowulf's future career—as the first move of disengagement from Danish affairs. The 'known tradition' that the Geats supported Hrethric is in fact a chain of inferences made by Malone, welcomed by Chambers (*Beowulf: An Introduction*, pp. 447 f.), but not taken up by Klaeber. It seems prudent to consider allusions to future relations between Danes and Geats (1826-65) as the formal courtesies of leave-taking rather than as a firm military alliance.

The difficult problem of sources is resolutely faced, but no real advance is made. Mr. Brodeur refers to three kinds of material: folk-tale, heroic legend, and historical tradition (p. 132). The first, without further definition, is no longer an acceptable description of a source of poetic composition, especially since de Vries indicated new approaches to the relation between folk-lore motives and heroic themes (*Folklore Fellows Communications* No. 150 (Helsinki, 1954)). A difference is made between 'heroic lays' (used to enrich the first half of the poem) and 'historical traditions' (supplying background and setting for the second half). But there is no satisfactory evidence for a separate origin for the second group. The types of oral poetry adduced cannot (in this area) be firmly distinguished in matter or form from heroic lays, while the supporting suggestion of 'oral prose narratives of a sort roughly comparable with the Icelandic royal sagas' is too vague, since the Kings' Sagas are careful literary compositions at several removes from any oral narrative.

It is necessary to stress the misleading features of the book, because the author writes out of intimate knowledge, and his views are well matured and eloquently phrased. Some important points of criticism have never been so well expressed. The use of Christian ethic and sentiment to ennoble persons and situations of ancient story is particularly well handled. An illuminating comparison is made with Chaucer's introduction of Christian elements in *Troilus and*

sure the outright speech in question, he al position relation say that speeches that changes that importa ferth's briefly age who dramatic estimate port for n; and it with e of the segment rethric (Beowulf, prudent 65) as e. nce is d, and longer nce de es and ()). A poem) half). group, ed in prose is too noves

the i and well s and paris and

Criseyde. Mr. Brodeur takes a sane and resolute stand on the description of Danish idol-worship. Not all will explain the relevance of ll. 168–88 in precisely these terms, but all should agree that this passage needs 'neither emendation nor defense'. The function of the long illustrative set-pieces is also well defined (p. 229).

The art of *Beowulf* is a subject by no means exhausted. Mr. Brodeur has established some important points of style, and raised many issues which should help other critics to clarify their own views.

JOAN TURVILLE-PETRE

The Salisbury Psalter. Edited from Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150 by CELIA SISAM and KENNETH SISAM. Pp. xii+312, 1 plate. (Early English Text Society 242.) London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1959. 84s. net.

This glossed psalter is made fully available for the first time, for hitherto only sample extracts had been published. This in itself is a useful service to scholarship, but its value is greatly enhanced by the studies the editors have printed in the introduction and appendixes, which include results bearing on a wide range of topics. The editors give a convincing explanation of the present state of the manuscript, a sound discussion of its localization and of the date both of the psalter and of its gloss, a study of the language in comparison with other evidence, a clear account of the versions of the Latin psalter and of their use in England (which corrects some previous misconceptions), and a clear treatment of the complicated problem of the interrelationship of the extant Anglo-Saxon psalter glosses. The value of this edition, therefore, extends far beyond the immediate interest of this particular text.

Among matters of general interest, attention is called (p. 7) to a major change in Southern English Insular writing in the reign of Athelstan, a fact which can be added to other evidence which shows that the first half of the tenth century was not as devoid of intellectual interests and achievement as the writers after the monastic revival would have us believe. The lack of Latin scholarship betrayed by the scribe, writing about 975, when glossing the Athanasian creed, shows that the standards of the monastic reformers had not reached the nunnery of Shaftesbury (p. 13). An unsolved problem is mentioned on p. 58: how did a ludicrously incorrect gloss come to be copied into the splendid Eadwine Psalter at Canterbury in the twelfth century? It is a pity that there is no means of knowing just when and where this gloss with its many howlers was written. One would like to connect it with Alfred's lament over the decay of Latin learning, supported as this is by the bad Latin of charters produced at Canterbury in the early ninth century; but this can only be speculation. Another point of interest which emerges (p. 6) is that a service book in Insular script was still being used in the thirteenth century.

As regards linguistics, it is extremely valuable to have a manuscript so securely localized. The discussion of the features of its language derives great importance from the wide and exact knowledge shown of the state of things in other manu-

scripts. Thus the use in the gloss to the Athanasian creed, which is contemporary with the Latin text, of *æ* for the *i*-mutation of *a* before a nasal, which provides further evidence that this feature is not a mark of South-Eastern colouring in Anglo-Saxon times, is compared with the same usage in Tanner MS. 10, from Thorney, in Arundel MS. 60, from Winchester, and in C.C.C.C. MS. 201, possibly a Worcester book. The last is one of the manuscripts containing Wulfstan works, and the feature under discussion occurs sporadically in other Wulfstan manuscripts; it is reasonable to suppose that the archbishop used the same secretaries whether he was working at Worcester or at York, and hence these may have introduced this spelling into the scriptorium at York. C.C.C.C. MS. 201, which has the only surviving text of the Northumbrian Priests' Law, may have been produced there. Hence the occurrence of this feature in the 'D' manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is not a stumbling-block in the way of assigning this version to York. The material collected on this point should serve as a warning that it is not always safe to argue from Middle English conditions when localizing pre-Conquest texts.

The main gloss is dated *c.* 1100, and it is suggested that the glossator, who was not a trained scribe, may have been a nun with little knowledge of Latin. As stated on p. 28, the language is interesting 'chiefly for the evidence it provides of South-Western English at the beginning of the twelfth century', which means that it 'bridges the gap between late West Saxon and the South-Western dialects of early Middle English'. The tendency to confuse *u* and *y* is here attributed to the sporadic use of the *v*-shaped *u*, and a number of examples of this confusion in pre-Conquest manuscripts is given (p. 24 and note 2). Examples of this confusion can be found in capitals on coins: for example, *Durmod* is sometimes spelt *Dyrmud* in the reigns of Eadred and Edgar; *Wunstan* occurs beside the correct *Wynstan* on coins of Edgar and Ethelred; the latter reign supplies *Wylfnoð* for *Wulfnoð* and *Dyrstan* for *Durstan*; and *Wunsige* is the name of a moneyer on Edgar's coins and those of Cnut.

As examples of additions to linguistic knowledge may be selected the following: the collection of material which suggests that in late Old English in some areas *eo* > *o* before *r* plus consonant, and *ēo* > *ō* in the neighbourhood of labial consonants (§ 62 (ii)); the examples of the strange sound-change of *cn*- to *cw*-, which prove that this was more widespread than Napier, who assigned it to Kent or East Anglia, supposed (§ 67); the demonstration that the loss of *c* from the groups *nct*, *ncþ* is not confined to Kentish (§ 70), any more than is the tendency of final *b* to become *t* in reduced stress (§ 71 f.); and the explanation of the inflected infinitive in *-ende*, instead of *-enne*, as representing a sporadic phonetic tendency, and not, with Brunner, an imitation of Latin, or, with Wright, the influence of the present participle (§ 74). Minor points of interest are the appearance as early as *c.* 1100 of the form *hæd(de)* 'had' (§ 75) and the evidence that the *-segon* form of the preterite plural of *-seon* had spread from Anglian to the South-West in late Old English (§ 75, n. 1).

All future students of Old English psalter glosses will find their labours eased by the account, in Section IX and Appendix II, of their interrelation. These portions of the book provide a model of how extremely intricate evidence can be

made to give firm conclusions, set out with amazing lucidity. The Salisbury gloss is shown to be the addition, over a Gallican text, of a gloss to the Roman version best represented by MS. Royal 2 B. v, cited as D. It was probably not copied direct from this, but through at least one intermediary, and it is independent of other copies of this gloss. D is shown to be itself a copy, and to be independent of the Vespasian Psalter gloss or any other. It was very influential, for all later glosses, except Cambridge University Library MS. Ff. 1. 23 (based on the Vespasian Psalter type of gloss), are influenced by it. Three of these later glosses, Cotton Vitellius E. xviii, Cotton Tiberius C. vi, and Arundel MS. 60, though using D, are also witnesses to a lost gloss available in Winchester Cathedral about the middle of the eleventh century. The gloss in Stowe MS. 2 is shown to share the same intermediary as does Arundel MS. 60 in its use of D. While agreeing with Lindelöf that the gloss in Lambeth MS. 427 has many original features, Dr. Sisam differs in holding that it used a D-type source. Appendix II closes with a salutary warning against drawing too close the patches of evidence which have happened to survive from what was once a vast array of texts. He shows that a large proportion of extant psalters have come from the two great centres of Canterbury and Winchester. Chances of survival were much higher for these libraries than for many other Anglo-Saxon houses. Though this warning is made in relation to the study of psalters, students of other Anglo-Saxon records should lay it to heart.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK

The French Text of the *Ancrene Riwle*. Edited from Trinity College Cambridge MS. R. 14. 7 with variants from Bibliothèque Nationale MS. F. Fr. 6276 and MS. Bodley 90 by W. H. TRETHEWEY. Pp. xxxiv+272 (Early English Text Society 240). London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1958. 45s. net.

This very skilfully edited volume presents extracts from an Anglo-Norman religious treatise which are derived from the *Ancrene Riwle*. The work consists of five separate treatises (on the Sins, Penance, the Commandments, Purgatory, and the Religious Life), each being called a *compileison* in the manuscript (p. xviii), and the term 'Compilation' has been adopted to describe the collection as a whole. The editor calculates that about 42 per cent. of the Compilation, which is over 29,000 lines long, derives from the *Riwle*. The borrowings are in the first, second, and fifth *compileisons*, and the whereabouts of the borrowed passages in this edition can be traced with the help of a table on pp. xxv–xxvi (for 226/27 read 266/27). It would have been helpful if this table had given line references to the Nero text in the E.E.T.S. edition (No. 225) as well as to Morton's edition, since the latter is now very difficult to obtain, and must be even more difficult to find outside England. The chief passages not included in the Compilation are Parts I and VIII (Religious Service and the Outer Rule) and two sections of the long Part V on Temptation (Progeny of the Beasts and Comforts against Temptation). There is much interesting material in the Compilation, but naturally the debts to the *Riwle* determine the choice of extracts for the present edition.

Identifying passages which are sometimes quite short must have been a teasing and lengthy task.

The question of the relation of this French version to that in MS. Cotton Vitellius F vii is excluded from the introduction and reserved for study elsewhere (p. xi, n. 1), so, for the present, the subject remains where Miss Allen left it with her opinion that 'the divergence from the Cotton version seems far too serious to be explained as the result of long circulation',¹ together with her modified opinion 'that a further close study of Trin. has left her less confident that they may not eventually be found to be "widely divergent descendants of a common ancestor"' (quoted in the introduction to J. A. Herbert's edition of the Cotton version, E.E.T.S. 219 (1944), p. xiv). Miss Allen's further point that the compiler used not the original *Rivole* but a version already expanded and generalized is also reserved for later discussion.

Certain points in the description of the manuscript (partly quoted from M. R. James) need slight revisions (pp. xii–xiii). It is not made clear that *Merveilles de engletere* is in the same hand as the preceding items, and belongs to the same part of the manuscript as *Oratio Dominica, &c.* A new scribal unit begins with *le liure de reis de Brut (Chronicon Anglie)* on f. 163^a, after a column has been left blank at f. 162^d. It is difficult to see why the manuscript is described as 'in several volumes'. The editor twice mentions the darker ink of a redipped pen in corrections and retouched letters (pp. xiii, xiv), but I think it is not made apparent how very frequently certain letters have been retouched, notably *r*, *u*, and *t*, in order to remove the ambiguity of *c/t* and *u/n* (cf. p. xxviii). The scribe tended to link groups of minims at the top, or both top and bottom, and therefore the retouching is often to distinguish *u* (but not *n*), and the scribe's normal top linking is often scraped away.

When giving a helpful section on the language of the Trinity manuscript on p. xxx the editor notes that the edition 'may be used mostly by non-specialists in Anglo-Norman', and one wonders whether the edition as a whole could not have been made a little easier for such non-specialists to use. It would have been helpful if the list of errors on pp. xvii, xxviii had been longer (similar to the classification of errors in Dr. Day's introduction to the Nero text (E.E.T.S. 225), p. xvii). The fact that the obvious errors and doubtful readings which remain in the text 'must be controlled by the variants given at the foot of the page' (p. xxvii) may make this edition difficult going for some people. The principle of reproducing the manuscript exactly as it stands need not forbid some signal for errors in the text, since exactness is disregarded for convenience in giving the foliation of all three manuscripts actually in the text. We thus get such non-manuscript and eye-disturbing forms as 'essam= [Bd 71^r] ples' (82/1) and 'cha [BN 51^d] pitle' (98/23).

One or two small points on carrying out the principle of 'exact' reproduction: the raised final -s often used by the Trinity scribe at the end of a line (e.g. querS 159/20, querS 159/23) is not a true majuscule, and if it must be distinguished in print some notation other than -S seems desirable. At 190/15 there is no need

¹ *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown* (New York, 1940), p. 213.

to print brackets, for the manuscript has a mark for crowding but no caret (cf. xxviii). At 160/33 a small space signals a hole avoided by the scribe: surely the description of the manuscript is the place to mention such defects in the writing materials, as it was on p. xvi of the Nero edition? There are more holes elsewhere in the manuscript. If it became a convention to leave a space for such a defect, there would be no suitable way to indicate occasions when a scribe does leave good writing space clear.

Except in the Latin text (No. 216), the E.E.T.S. *Ancrene Riwle* editions have kept not only punctuation and capitalization, but even expuncted letters and words. In the present edition an interesting stage in the development of writing habits at the end of a line is shown by the Trinity scribe's efforts to avoid ending a line with one letter of a word (e.g. m mort 99/6, m mout 221/3, cf. p. xxviii). The early use of carefully distinguished *perographs* in the compiler's editorial method is very striking (*si ad cinc perografs 1/2, 7/10, &c.*).

Besides its importance to the history of the *Ancrene Riwle* this edition offers much of interest to all engaged in editing. The introduction is a model of firm clarity in treating a most complicated recensional situation, and those who have studied this edition will look forward to Professor Trethewey's subsequent contributions to *Ancrene Riwle* scholarship.

JOY RUSSELL-SMITH

Early English Stages 1300-1660. By GLYNNE WICKHAM. Vol. I, 1300-1576. Pp. xliv+428. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959. 45s. net.

This, the first of two volumes, is intended to be 'a history of the development of dramatic spectacle and stage convention in England'. Its claim to be 'the first serious attempt' since Chambers's *Medieval Stage* 'to trace the indebtedness of the Elizabethan Court and Public Theatres to their antecedents in the Middle Ages' is not altogether unjustified, although Dr. Wickham's handling of his material suffers at times from over-statement and an understandable, but still dangerous, enthusiasm for seeing relevance where its existence is at best open to question. It is true, on the other hand, that any new approach to the problems of medieval drama must involve its author in a readiness to take risks, and this reviewer can at least say that he has enjoyed reading the book, and that Dr. Wickham has made some interesting and important contributions to the subject.

It is not true that critical works on this drama 'can fill only a few shelves', as C. J. Stratman's *Bibliography of Medieval Drama* (1954)—not mentioned by Dr. Wickham—shows. How 'widely held' is the belief 'that our English stage of Shakespeare's day and earlier was a dull, simple thing, virtually devoid of decoration to entrance the eye'? Dr. Wickham's thesis is good enough to stand on its own merits without the necessity for erecting and knocking down a large number of imaginary Aunt Sallies. A 'concordance of stage directions' (p. xxxv) would need to be used with great care, for the distinction between those of an authorial or literary nature and those which may be presumed to have had some bearing on the actual presentation of a play has not always been clearly drawn.

'To assume a common, European basis of stage procedure except where unimpeachable evidence exists to prove English practice exceptional' is dangerous, and has been responsible for loose thinking on these matters in the past; fortunately as Dr. Wickham proceeds he seems to get farther away from such an assumption, but he should not have made it in the first place.

His sections on the Tournament seem the least convincing. The material itself is interesting, and no doubt Dr. Wickham is right in pointing out how this phenomenon, 'designed originally as a battle school for war, but always carrying within itself the seed of drama, was forced by circumstances to allow that seed to grow... until the child eventually swallowed up its parent'. But it is a far cry from this to extracting 'the many elements of drama which grew out of the Tournament' and tracing their introduction into the Mummeries and Disguisings on the one hand, and the Civic Pageants and Miracle Plays on the other. One can see a possible link in the use of allegorical personages, but although this may apply to the Moralities it scarcely applies to the craft cycles. In any case it shows little more than that the allegorical method was common stock in the Middle Ages. The symbolical use of colour is a parallel case, and is well exemplified in *The Castle of Perseverance*. (It may be remarked here that Dr. Wickham later draws attention to the appearance of allegorical and biblical figures in the street pageants; again I do not see that this carries us beyond the conclusion that it is precisely what we would expect. It does not justify the conclusion, stated or implied, that the Miracles and Moralities were borrowers.) In a discussion of the staging of the tournament we read, 'it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that here, by 1501, is an auditorium the design of which anyone wishing to build a public theatre could do worse than follow'; it may also be concluded that the builder of a public theatre, having regard to his special requirements, would eventually be compelled to adopt such a design independently. There need be no necessary connexion. Dr. Wickham himself emphasizes the almost exclusively aristocratic nature of the Tournament, and while it may be regarded as a single, and not very significant, manifestation of medieval entertainment, I cannot follow him beyond this.

The material on the Pageant Theatres of the Streets and the conclusions drawn from it are more satisfactory. Here we are concerned with a more popular form of entertainment, and one which is better documented. It may be added that at York a Royal Entry was on two occasions at least followed by a performance of the religious plays of that city: in 1483 the Creed Play before Richard III, and in 1487 the Corpus Christi cycle before Henry VII. Presumably the same people, for the most part, would be involved both in the Entry Pageant (about which little information seems to exist for these two years) and in the subsequent religious performances. Both texts of the pageant for the visit of Henry VII in 1486, from the British Museum manuscript and from the York House Book, were printed by A. H. Smith in *London Medieval Studies* (1939).

The most satisfying section of the book is that on the Mystery Cycles (which Dr. Wickham insists on calling 'Miracle Plays', thus being compelled to use the term 'Saints' Plays' for what I would call 'miracles'). His arguments for the stamping out of these plays for political and ecclesiastical reasons are convincing,

and he might have adduced further evidence from York, where the accession of Edward VI led to the prompt suppression of the plays on the Death, Assumption, and Coronation of Our Lady, the accession of Mary to their equally prompt reinstatement, and the accession of Elizabeth to their final disappearance. He rightly stresses how local circumstances affected methods of performance, a factor too often disregarded in the past. His remarks on the way in which the cycles developed and his agnosticism about deliberate and wholesale translation from Latin into English are eminently sensible. In this connexion, as he observes, a long tradition of misunderstanding of Chester documents had been largely responsible. For this reason he might himself have gone more often to material outside Chester to support his points; such material exists, but admittedly is not readily accessible. A few errors have crept into this section. Dr. Wickham states (p. 122, n. 14) that the first specific record of the performance of plays in conjunction with the Corpus Christi festival in England comes from Beverley in 1377. It is strange that scholars have for so long overlooked the fact that the York Memorandum Book (Surtees Society, 1911) includes a list of miscellaneous rents dated 1376, among them the following: 'De uno tenemento in quo tres pagine Corporis Christi ponuntur per annum ijs.' One wonders, from the laconic nature of this entry, how long this particular payment had been going on; unfortunately the Book contains no entries before 1376. How far will this date upset Dr. Wickham's argument (p. 125) on the parallel development of the plays and the civic ridings? New life is given to the mistaken notion that William Melton, who in 1426 urged that the plays in York should be transferred from the Feast to the Vigil of Corpus Christi, was 'a professor of holy pageantry'; the original Latin reads 'sacre pagine professor', which means something entirely different! Dr. Wickham spends too much time discussing the staging of the *Ludus Coventriæ*; this is an interesting series, but hardly typical of the general run of mystery cycles.

In his section on Indoor Theatres and Entertainments, Dr. Wickham argues that 'alongside the open-air performance of Miracle Plays and Moralities, entertainments of a primarily secular kind were regularly given indoors and at night before both the nobility and the merchant bourgeoisie from the end of the fourteenth century onwards', and that 'the formulating of a regular drama, usually ascribed to the mid-sixteenth century, can be antedated by at least a hundred years in origin: and that these entertainments, both in their texts and in their staging, developed naturally into those offered in the Court and Private Theatres of Elizabethan times, neither of them owing very much to the alternative Public Theatres'. Some interesting points are made about Lydgate in this connexion, and about the importance of disguisings to the history of theatre architecture and stage design. Morals and Interludes, on the other hand, have their importance in their contribution to the history of acting in England. On these matters, and on the eventual fusion of the independent stages of religious and social origin, Dr. Wickham is thoughtful and informative. It may be noted that T. W. Craik's *The Tudor Interlude* (no doubt too recent to be used by Dr. Wickham) has further material on such things as cast-lists and staging. John Heywood was not a master at St. Paul's School (p. 242); his connexions with Redford and Westcott, who were masters, were close, but he does not seem to have had

any official position there. More might have been made of Westcott, who is not mentioned; he had a long tenure at the cathedral, appeared in dramatic performances with his boys year after year, and in spite of his 'popery' seems to have had patrons strong enough to keep him out of more than the minimum amount of trouble with the authorities.

The concluding sections on Dramatic Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages and on Audiences and Critics are again of a high standard. Dr. Wickham deals sensibly with the Church's attitude towards the stage, with the relative importance of amateur and professional actor, with their financial problems, and with the small troupes of travelling actors. On this last point his evidence will no doubt be considerably supplemented by the publication of Dr. Giles Dawson's material from Kentish sources.

Some omissions from the Bibliography have already been noted, and the following may be added to them: A. W. Reed's *Early Tudor Drama* (containing valuable information on the Interludes); W. L. Hildburgh's *English Alabaster Carvings as Records of the Medieval Religious Drama*, a surprising omission since so many of Dr. Wickham's illustrations are from these carvings; Madeleine Doran's *Endeavours of Art*; Willard Farnham's *Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*; and the Malone Society's *Chester Play Studies* by F. M. Salter and W. W. Greg. Dr. Wickham uses R. Davies's *York Records of the Fifteenth Century*; this may be supplemented by the more recent volumes of York Civic Records edited by Angelo Raine and published by the Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

ARTHUR BROWN

The Traditional Tunes of the Child Ballads, with their Texts, according to the Extant Records of Great Britain and America. By BERTRAND HARRIS BRONSON. Vol. I, Ballads 1 to 53. Pp. xxxviii+466. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. £10 net.

'But the French Academy, which consists of forty members, took forty years to compile their Dictionary . . .' Professor Bronson, who is also one of the most profound of Johnsonians, would be too modest to complete the quotation, with so much ease and pleasantry does he talk of that prodigious labour which he has undertaken to execute. Merely to assemble the material accurately is itself an immense work, which only great skill in modern filing technique has made possible. There are 305 ballads in Child's canon, of which over 200 have recorded tunes: some ballads have only one tune each (and some of these are of doubtful authenticity), others as many as 200. This volume with about 1,000 'independently derived versions' of the Child ballad tunes is roughly a fifth part of a collection which, I understand, will be completed in a few years.

Mr. Bronson gives sound reasons for keeping to Child's limits, arbitrary as these have seemed to some scholars: if he did not, he would have to collect almost the whole of English and American folksong. There are, of course, certain 'non-ballad' songs closely related to Child ballads, as 'Billy Boy' is related to 'Lord Randal', and three of these are placed in appendixes. The collection is

exhaustive down to the end of the nineteenth century, but thenceforward increasingly selective: in the age of the tape-recorder it is not necessary to print a transcript of every variant, and may even be undesirable, since musical notation can give only a rough approximation to a folksinger's performance, which may vary from stanza to stanza. A large proportion of the tunes come from the manuscripts of those great collectors, Cecil Sharp and Gavin Greig. Tunes from less reliable sources have been reconstructed into folksong idiom where necessary, but the originals are given as well as the reconstructions. A brief code description of the character of each tune is provided, using the medieval names for the modes and a beautifully simple system for the hexatonic and pentatonic gapped scales and for the range (authentic, plagal, or mixed). Where the text going with a tune is original, and not just a composite of other Child versions, this is given too. The result is a treasury of incomparable value to the singer, arranger, or composer; one wishes that Vaughan Williams and Bartok had lived to see it, and rejoices that it is available to Britten.

That, however, is an outline of only part of Bronson's work. In attempting to classify the tunes and to analyse their relationships he has taken on a problem of bewildering complexity, as is known to anyone who has tried to grapple with it in the most amateur way (and compared with Bronson we are all amateurs). For example, 'Lady Isabel and the Elf Knight' has 141 tunes, and 'Young Beichan' ('Lord Bateman', no. 53) has 112. In these and about a dozen others, the tunes fall into distinct groups and sub-groups, each characterized by the persistence of some melodic or rhythmic pattern. With impeccable judgement Mr. Bronson has placed the tunes of each group in a morphological sequence, indicating the changes they have undergone in two centuries or in passing from Scotland to the Appalachians. To make his groupings clearer, he has transposed where necessary, though quoting the original key; and he discusses the relationships that leap to the ear and eye in a foreword to each ballad. Thus, he is able to show the persistence of a rhythmic pattern through many versions of 'The Cruel Mother' (no. 20), and the family likeness of the plagal Æolian tune of 'Thomas Rymer' (no. 37) to tunes used for four other ballads. He does not pretend that he has yet produced a general law of folksong development: with this book the discipline reaches the Linnaean stage, but Mr. Bronson's introduction and some articles of his show that it may soon be graced with a theory of Darwinian scope. Already he has proved the tendency of folksingers to extend $\frac{3}{4}$ into $\frac{4}{4}$ time, $\frac{4}{4}$ into $\frac{5}{4}$, and finally to $\frac{6}{4}$ or $\frac{3}{2}$ (p. 324); and other important generalizations can be gleaned from the notes.

The strength of the notes, however, lies in their wealth of historical detail. Mr. Bronson's musicological range is, to say the least, wide: he traces, for example, two tunes (to nos. 1 and 4) back to Gregorian chant, in the former case through Durfey. When he concludes that few foreign tunes have found their way into English or Scottish balladry, we can feel confident that this assertion does not arise from insufficient knowledge. Although few would today wish to discuss ballads without taking their music into consideration, there are still many who can only read them, and for them there is much of non-musical interest in the notes. The famous 'Corpus Christi', for example, is discussed in

relation to 'The Three Ravens' (no. 26), and before 'Young Beichan' (no. 53, p. 409) there is an important comment on printing and oral tradition: contrary to the accepted view, Mr. Bronson convincingly maintains that far from killing the ancient folk versions, printing was 'one of the most potent aids in keeping them alive'.

As a collection of texts, this volume is also unparalleled since Child. I estimate that it contains some 20,000 lines of ballad verse, little of which is to be found in Child. A few of the texts were available in Child's lifetime but were missed by him. Most of them, coming from unpublished manuscripts, scattered articles, and American collections, have hitherto been unknown or not easily available to English readers, who will find the collection almost as rich in poetry as in music. The author may well call himself *vasta mole superbus*.

M. J. C. HODGART

More Talking of Shakespeare. Edited by JOHN GARRETT. Pp. x+190.
London: Longmans, Green, 1959. 21s. net.

Mr. Garrett's Stratford lecturers maintain a high level of competence. They have the advantage of an intelligent but unspecialized audience and most of the lectures in this collection will appeal to the general reader rather than to the expert. Some of them, however, hardly bear the ordeal of print. Dr. Yellowlees's discussion of medicine and surgery in some of Shakespeare's plays must have been greeted with continuous laughter, but to many readers it will seem excessively facetious. Mr. Wain, aided by his reputation as a novelist, presumed to lecture on the mind of Shakespeare. He presented, with an air of challenge, views which now win almost universal acceptance.

The remaining ten lectures were all worth preserving. Professor Nevill Coghill contrasts the crude jokes of historical fools with the subtleties of Shakespeare's. Miss Helen Gardner, making use of Mrs. Langer's *Feeling and Form*, gives us an admirable essay on *As You Like It*; and Miss Mary Lascelles, discussing Shakespeare's pastoral comedy as a whole, has an excellent appreciation of Montemayor's *Diana* and of Young's underrated translation of it. (Why was it never included in the Tudor Translations?) Mr. Graham Storey, after some hesitation, concludes that *Much Ado* has more unity than at first appears. Professor H. D. F. Kitto, comparing Shakespeare with the Greek dramatists, has some valuable comments on the Histories. He argues that Shakespeare, Sophocles, and Aeschylus 'are speaking in the same grave and spacious way of nothing less than the terms on which the gods will let us live'.

Professor L. C. Knights returns to the question of character in Shakespeare's plays, modifying the views he held in 1932, but clinging quite properly to the belief that

it is in our imaginative response to *the whole play*—not simply to what can be extracted as 'character', nor indeed to what can be simply extracted as 'theme' or 'symbol'—that the meaning lies.

Mr. J. I. M. Stewart, writing gracefully on 'Shakespeare's men and their morals', also modifies his previous position. He is less confident now about the validity

(no. 53, contrary to killing keeping estimate bound in articles, available as in GART +190. They of the weeles's t have excessed ned to llenge, Coghill eare's, us an Shakespeare Honte never hesita fessor some ocles, less eare's to the can be me'e' rals', idity

of Freudian interpretations, though he admits the fascination they still hold for him. His summary of Shakespearian morality might almost have been written by Raleigh. The characters, he says,

are not, in fact, the creations of a moralist. They are not even the creations of an artist who is obliged to pretend at all hard to be a moralist. Rather they are the elements in an entertainment of which the stuff and substance is, indeed, the moral nature of man, but the end of which is not moralistic. He deals with morals always; but as a moralist, never.

Mr. Harry Levin touches on a similar theme in his able but discursive discussion of the scene between Edgar and Gloucester near Dover. Mr. Norman Marshall laments the absence today of dramatic reporting (as opposed to dramatic criticism) and he suggests that to the ordinary reader 'many of the points which a critic deals with may seem finicky and unimportant'. Finally, Professor James Sutherland discusses the language of the last plays, in which he finds 'a new recklessness of expression' and 'an even stronger impression of hurry and impatience'. He thinks that Shakespeare was not bored, as Strachey thought, but tired. He has one ingenious—perhaps over-ingenuous—suggestion to make: that the Queen's lines in *Cymbeline*—

To be depender on a thing that leans,
Who cannot be new built, nor has no friends,
So much as but to prop him—

were prompted by the words Shakespeare has written for Pisanio's entrance a few lines before ('Enter *Pisa*.') and their association with the leaning tower. The Folio text, however, prints Pisanio's name in full at this point. We do not know whether Shakespeare abbreviated it here in his manuscript or whether he knew of the leaning tower.

KENNETH MUIR

Thomas Heywood et le drame domestique élisabéthain. By MICHEL GRIVELET. Pp. 408 (Études anglaises 4). Paris: Didier, 1957. Fr. 1,800.

Running to more than 200,000 words, M. Grivelet's book surveys many aspects of Heywood's life and work. Carefully sifting the abundant criticism and research which have appeared since A. M. Clark's *Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist* (1931), M. Grivelet discusses and documents biographical questions, Heywood's character, the periods of his work, his audience, his stagecraft, his imagery, his pageants, his alleged authorship of Puritan pamphlets, and his literary reputation from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. His generalizations about these topics are usually judicious and authoritative. He aptly defines Heywood's humour as jovial rather than witty, and skilfully illustrates the tenderness and fluency which are the distinguishing characteristics of his imagination, though he somewhat belittles the importance of the playwright in the hierarchy of forces in the Elizabethan theatre when he declares that 'l'œuvre littéraire est subordonnée à la représentation scénique, centrée elle-même sur l'acteur . . .' (p. 47). We know that Shakespeare and Jonson, in Elizabethan parlance, 'instructed' the actors of their plays. Heywood was an able actor and he may well

have followed their example. His *Apology for Actors* contains one of the few discussions of the art of acting by an actor-playwright of the Elizabethan period.

As an examination of Heywood's life and works, M. Grivelet's study supersedes Clark's genial volume and must be ranked first among the general discussions of this dramatist. It has, moreover, a central thesis which justifies the emphasis given by its title to 'le drame domestique élisabéthain'. Disagreeing with Clark's description of Heywood as a 'dramatic journalist', M. Grivelet argues that his works are unified by a dominant idea—'cette conviction profonde que les vertus civiques nécessaires à l'État national se fondent sur les vertus proprement domestiques et qu'en définitive le vrai drame modern se joue dans le secret de l'intimité conjugale' (p. 149). Heywood was fond of puns; one of his most characteristic is a play on the public and private connotations of the word 'domestic'. M. Grivelet enhances the value of 'domestic' as a critical term in the discussion of Elizabethan drama by showing that it is most significant when applied to plays specifically concerned with the husband-wife relationship instead of being used to describe a vague species of didactic realism. It was not until the sixteenth century that the relationship between man and wife became a theme for elevated poetry. Erasmus prepared the way for this development by exalting matrimony above the other sacraments, and Spenser was the first English poet to treat it with romantic idealism, but drama was the form best suited to the imaginative treatment of this theme, and among Elizabethan playwrights Heywood is notable for the frequency with which he makes marriage the starting-point rather than the conclusion of his plays; 'le mariage et son drame, voilà le motif principal, le thème majeur de son théâtre' (p. 119). M. Grivelet thus disagrees with those critics who would put *A Woman Killed with Kindness* in a different category from Heywood's other works.

M. Grivelet also disagrees with T. S. Eliot's claim that Heywood found his best subject in *The English Traveller*; on the contrary, he declares, 'elle perd en vigueur ce qu'elle gagne en complexité' and the infidelity of Mrs. Wincott 'n'inspire que faiblement l'horreur sacrée qui s'attache à la profanation du foyer' (p. 191). M. Grivelet gives special attention to the play which treats this 'horreur sacrée' most fully, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. His critique is the most detailed and judicious examination of this minor masterpiece that has so far appeared. The readers for whom M. Grivelet writes could have been spared the lengthy 'analyse de la pièce' with which his chapter begins, but the ensuing sections contain stimulating discussions of the sources and structure of the play and of the moral and psychological conventions which determine its meaning. Against those who believe that Anne Frankford succumbs to adultery much too easily, he argues that 'la philosophie de la Renaissance' found women by nature 'fragiles et impressionables' (p. 221); perhaps so, but good drama will transcend stereotyping of this kind. His discussion of Wendoll, the other adulterer, is excellent. At the outset, Wendoll is ominously associated with the dance called 'the shaking of the sheets', which suggests both the marriage-bed and the winding sheet. This duality is maintained when he combines friendship for Frankford with courtly love for Anne. It is finally resolved in his last speech, where images of Cain and remorse are effaced by his ambition to become a courtier. Frankford

has been described as a prig and has been blamed for the psychotic feeling of guilt which causes his wife to starve herself to death. M. Grivelet, however, argues convincingly that Frankford is an essentially sacerdotal character, pointing out that once Anne has repented he restores her to the dignity of wifehood and promises her salvation. The atmosphere and imagery of the play support this religious interpretation of its action; so, too, does the sub-plot, which M. Grivelet defends against the attacks of Schlegel, Swinburne, and Clark. By contrasts and parallels, the sub-plot throws into strong relief the ideas of justice and honour, mercy and forgiveness, out of which Heywood has fashioned what is rather 'divine comédie' than tragedy.

A Woman Killed with Kindness is the fullest expression of the ideas which permeate Heywood's work. Even his *Oenone and Paris* (1593) is not so much an erotic poem after the manner of *Venus and Adonis* as a drama of conjugal infidelity. The relationship between husband and wife is also a major theme in plays which superficially seem to be about very different matters, such as *Edward IV*, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, *The Captives*, *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, and *A Challenge for Beauty*. The true hero of *Edward IV*, for instance, is the loyal citizen, Matthew Shore, whose wife is seduced by the king. This situation also illustrates a basic theme of Heywood's history plays; that 'la véritable chevalerie est passée de l'ancienne noblesse aux classes populaires et bourgeois' (p. 137). Idealism of this kind flourished better during the reign of Elizabeth than in the Jacobean and Caroline periods, but Heywood remained true to it throughout his long literary career, and his unbroken allegiance to his domestic principles is attested by such prose works as *Gunaikreon* (1624) and *A Curtain Lecture* (1637). In addition to works by or on Heywood, M. Grivelet's bibliography contains a very useful list of treatises on the social life and domestic ideas of the sixteenth century.

WILLIAM A. ARMSTRONG

The Life Records of John Milton. By J. MILTON FRENCH. Vol. V, pp. viii+518.
New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1958. \$7.50.

Professor French is to be congratulated on the completion of his immense task, begun many years ago, of collecting, as far as possible in chronological order, all the evidence for Milton's life. This last volume is divided into five sections, covering (1) the last five years of Milton's life, (2) further biographical facts to which even an approximate date cannot be assigned, (3) the history of his family before his birth, (4) the history of his family and affairs after his death, and (5) additions and corrections to Volumes I-IV.

There is more material for a portrait of Milton in his habit as he lived during his latter years than at any previous period; this is largely due to the answers by Christopher Milton and Elizabeth Fisher to the interrogatories on Milton's will, and still more to the observations and anecdotes collected after his death by Aubrey and Richardson. It would have been convenient to have all this material gathered at one place; but it is dispersed by Mr. French, some items being given in section 1 and some in section 2. What is more confusing is that some items are

given in both sections, or are repeated in section 2 of this volume after having been given a dated place in a previous volume. Thus Elizabeth Fisher's testimony, that Milton had told her of the reported remark of his daughter Mary on his third marriage a little before that event, is given in its proper place in Vol. IV, at the beginning of the year 1663, but is given again under 'Items without Date' in Vol. V. Such dispersal and repetition of data makes it all the more regrettable that a complete index to the whole work, promised in the preface to Vol. III, has not been provided; all we have are the separate indexes to each volume. A general index in a work of reference of this kind is a practical necessity.

The previous history of the poet's family has an obvious bearing on his own life and character. In this section there is no problem of what to include or in what order, and Mr. French has done the job with his usual thoroughness. But what to include in a posthumous history is a thorny problem. Mr. French decided to limit this fourth section to biographical data about Milton's family, the first publications of posthumous works and posthumous translations of the Latin works, and the first appearance of important early biographies. The result is that we are given all the available facts about the later career of brother Christopher for instance, though they reflect little or no light on the poet, but are told nothing of the later editions of Milton's works, which constitute his real posthumous history.

The following are a few particular points I have noted. Mr. French says (p. 89) of the second edition of *Paradise Lost* that the only justifications of the 'Revised and Augmented' on the title-page are a few lines called for by the redivision into twelve books, the Dolle portrait, and the commendatory verses by S. B. and A. M. This draws attention to the fact that there was little augmentation but entirely ignores the close revision of the text. At p. 102, after quoting the anonymous biographer's description of Milton's demeanour, 'his Gate erect and Manly, bespeaking Courage and undauntedness (or a Nil conscire)', Mr. French comments that 'the Latin phrase means "to be conscious of nothing"'. This dictionary translation misses the Horatian allusion and thereby the sense. In the additions and corrections to previous volumes (p. 390, addition to Vol. I, p. 420) 'Modern Language Notes' should read 'Modern Language Review'.

B. A. WRIGHT

Alexander Pope. The Poetry of Allusion. By REUBEN ARTHUR BROWER. Pp. xiv+368. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 35s. net.

Three decades of scholarship, learning, and criticism have without fuss or gesture lodged Pope, with every appearance of security, in as lofty a place among English poets as he or any of his friends could have desired. During two of these decades Mr. Brower has been at work on the book under review. He is fully aware of the best that has been thought and done on behalf of Pope in the course of his reestablishment.

In 1929 Professor George Sherburn, introducing his *Selections from Alexander Pope* in an essay which did much to quicken and deepen appreciation of this poet, wrote:

It is one of the ironies of literary fate that Mr. Pope, once the poet of dukes, bishops, and statesmen, should now be commemorated chiefly by Grubean academics whom he might have consigned to his *Dunciad*. . . and now after a long period of neglect it is possible to write more sympathetically of the satirist who was a poetic sensation two centuries ago.

In 1945 when, *inter alia*, Sherburn's *Early Career of Alexander Pope* (1934) and Dr. Leavis's *Revaluations* (1936), with its essays on 'Pope' and 'The Augustan Tradition' had already appeared, the general editor of *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope* modestly claimed, in a volume in honour of a veteran Pope scholar, that

The twentieth-century reader is beginning to discover that there is enjoyment to be obtained from the poetry of Pope, but he is still in danger of misunderstanding what Pope was trying to express and the methods he used.

The time for apology has now passed, and although the poetry of neither Pope nor of any other poet will ever be entirely free from all danger of misunderstanding Mr. Brower can and does write in the full assurance that few poets are today read with more pleasure, have been more competently edited, or more justly appreciated. Most judges today would hold Dryden to be his inferior, would credit burlesque and mock-heroic with their own special quality of 'high seriousness', and recognize in the wit characteristic of his work elements relating it to the 'metaphysical' wit of the earlier half of the seventeenth century. Many would agree that some of the most powerful and relentless of his satiric strokes—one or two of the 'ruling passion strong in death' scenes, the end of Villiers, the career of Sir Balaam—are qualified by touches of a rare and delicate compassion. Pope's greatest poem, the mock-heroic *Dunciad*, comes halfway in time and temper between the heroic *Paradise Lost* and the unheroic *Prelude*.

Pope was not greatly interested in the fate of man outside contemporary civilization, or in unknown modes of being. The classics offered themselves to him with their array of brilliant and familiar parallels to the life that was the source of his own poetry. Here were old and proved wisdom, order without monotony, an urbanity with no lack of those excitements which civilized living promotes.

Mr. Brower's book is admirably articulate. It does—almost too well—what it sets out to do. The two Augustan worlds are seen in relation. The English Augustans may not have been quite as Augustan, nor Augustan in quite the same way, as they sometimes thought, but certainly they derived much of their detachment and high sense of order and accomplishment from close and pleasurable study and imitation of their predecessors. Here the characteristics of both receive authoritative treatment and scholarly definition. There is nothing that a reader will have to unlearn, though it may take a little time for him to recover a sense of proportion.

Just as the late Sir Charles Firth's lecture on *The Political Significance of Gulliver's Travels* makes us, while we read it, forget that there is anything in *Gulliver* other than politics, so we may be tempted in the enjoyment of Mr. Brower's scholarship to see Pope as, in the main, a brilliant transformer of one

sort of poetical achievement into another. But the power of *Gulliver* is not in its political allusions nor that of Pope's poetry in its allusions to the classics.

Mr. Brower writes with the strength and conviction that come from long consideration and ample knowledge of his subject. He is as informative and interesting on those poets whom Pope loved as on Pope himself, whom he sees as immensely sensitive not only to those aspects of contemporary life with which as a satirist he chose to concern himself, but to all kinds of poetic achievement.

In an excellent opening essay on Dryden he sees him marking the reaffirmation of 'Europe' in English poetry and culture and shows him to be Pope's master, not only in versification, but as making him free for the purposes of poetry of his predecessors as they lived in the mind of contemporary Europe. At the end of this book Pope is declared to be 'perhaps the last major English poet to feel at home with the whole European and English tradition in poetry.'

That much of what he has to tell us is entirely new Mr. Brower would be the last man to claim; there is certainly a freshness and energy in his book that arrest and captivate. It provides at once something like a crib for the uneducated and the lazy—the chapter entitled 'True Heroic Poetry' demands particular and favourable notice—a guide to the uninspired, and a reminder to the forgetful. He is happiest in writing on 'The Shepherd's Song', most thought-provoking in his handling of the power and influence of Horace. The real work of this book will be done when we have absorbed and mastered its contents and then forgotten them. Mr. Brower will not make us think Pope a greater poet than we did; he may well make him seem more interesting. Only professional scholars, for whom presumably he does not write, will read the *Dunciad* with all its notes more than once. Everyone should do so once, and lovers of Pope will read this book more often.

H. V. D. DYSON

Dr. Burney's Musical Tours in Europe. Edited by PERCY A. SCHOLES. Vol. I, pp. xxxvi+328; Vol. II, pp. xii+268. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. £5. 5s. net.

Burney's *Present State of Music in France and Italy* and *Present State of Music in Germany* (1771 and 1773; second editions, 1773 and 1775) were journals of tours undertaken by the author in the course of research for his *History of Music*. They were accounts of the European musical scene, and only secondarily travel-books in the ordinary sense, hardly enough so to justify Johnson's praise of Burney as 'one of the first writers of the age for travels', which Dr. Scholes prints as the epigraph to his edition. The German *Tour*, however, is less specialized than the Italian, which in turn appeared in a more specialized form than Burney had originally planned. Burney omitted the non-musical parts of this first journal on the advice of friends, later transcribing them into two not quite identical manuscripts. One of these is now in the British Museum; the other was the property of the late Dr. Scholes. The first volume of this edition gives us, for the first time, what the editor believes to have been the original complete form in which Burney had intended to print the Italian journal, in a composite

text based on the manuscripts and early editions. The second volume reprints the German *Tour* from the early editions. The two volumes, beautifully produced, are similar in format to Scholes's *The Great Dr. Burney*.

It is good to have these journals fully reprinted in a modern edition. Apart from the presumably considerable specialist interest of his musical reportage, Burney is an attractive writer and an attractive man. The *Tours* are in a class of their own, lacking the ecstatic prolixity which mars so many of the travel-books of the period; free, at the other extreme, of the exuberantly caustic tone of Smollett's *Travels*. Burney's writing has an engaging ordinariness, a 'soundness' due probably to the fact that he was mainly concerned with professional musical appraisal rather than with the recording and exploiting of personal impressions. The fair-mindedness of his musical criticism, the tendency, in particular, always to avoid extreme and savage censure, suggest the tolerant and companionable personality of the non-musical passages, the man who, in the midst of appalling travelling conditions, finds things 'better than I expected' (the contrast between parallel passages in Burney's journal and Smollett's *Travels* is revealing). The material printed from manuscript is valuable. It includes additions to the printed accounts of meetings with Diderot and Rousseau (the fine description of the visit to Voltaire is given in full in the original editions); detailed observation of many Italian paintings; and some very good prose, notably a bald and horrifying account, at second hand, of an execution in Rome.

The manuscript portions are distinguished from the original published text by being enclosed in square brackets. The difficulties of the editor's "jig-saw" task have been solved at least to the extent that the finished product reads plausibly like continuous narrative. But manuscript and printed text sometimes overlap, and the pieces in the jig-saw have had to be adjusted and manipulated into place. The system of square brackets does not always show where this has been done or enable us to reconstruct the reading of a passage in its original published form. We are not told that the description of Diderot's daughter (i. 317), from the early editions, is here placed after, and not as in the early editions, before, the account of the gift of Diderot's papers to Burney (i. 316), because a connecting piece from the manuscript appeared to require the re-ordering; and the uncommented use of square brackets leaves the false impression that the account of the 'celebrated little German, Mozart' (i. 162, also in altered sequence) is a manuscript addition, when most of it occurs also in the published version. Textual information is altogether scant. Small verbal discrepancies between all the texts would hardly have been worth noting, but when, as in the Verona section (i. 94-95), the second edition adds several paragraphs to the first, the fact is worth a mention. The book was, no doubt, not designed for the textual scholar; but since some trouble was taken to indicate the editor's handling of the text, and since the edition is otherwise very fully annotated, it is a pity not to have a little more textual documentation.

The notes, usually interesting and useful, err, perhaps, on the generous side. We are told exactly who Leo X, Marivaux, Ossian, were; at the other extreme, hosts of minor singers, instrumentalists, and composers are identified. Erratically, the violinist Somis, mentioned at i. 41 and ii. 177 but not in the very full

index, is only identified at ii. 192 n. 6. There is no means of knowing, at the earlier references, that information is available later; nor, since there were two violinists of that name, whether the same man is meant throughout. Other notes are needlessly garrulous. A reference to Giuseppe Baretti's brother, whom Burney met at Turin, inspires a note on Giuseppe's trial in London for killing a man (i. 59); Burney's mention of the amphitheatre at Verona touches off Dr. Scholes's memories of having seen there 'an "International Festival of Roller-skating" in which a Spanish girl of ten executed the most startling evolutions, followed by a hockey match on skates which lasted until midnight' (i. 94). There are a few slips. It is surely Bernard de Fontenelle (ii. 103) and Thérèse le [not de] Vasseur (i. 313). It is too much to say that Voltaire was 'intimate' with Pope (i. 44), and to call Mrs. Thrale Johnson's 'patroness' (i. 188) is not the happiest of oversimplifications. Dr. Scholes omits to identify the lines quoted by Burney (i. 19) from Pope's *Second Satire of Dr. John Donne, Versified* (ll. 33-34), but takes the trouble to tell us where the words 'damn with faint praise' come from (i. 114). An appendix on 'Italian music versus French music' and a bibliography of the Italian *Tour* are provided, but no bibliography of the German *Tour*. These, however, are small points, and the two volumes are most welcome.

C. J. RAWSON

William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esq. By CHARLES RYSKAMP. Pp. xviii+276. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. 30s. net.

This is an important study of Cowper's early life up to the time of his removal from Huntingdon to Olney when he was almost thirty-six. Although many biographies, 'portraits', and critical evaluations of him have appeared during the last century and a half, none since Southey's *Life and Works* in 1835-7 and Thomas Wright's *Life* in 1892 and 1921 have added much to our factual knowledge of his early period. A restatement of the facts, a re-examination of the sources of information, and an inquiry into what the first biographers, Hayley, Greatheed, and John Johnson, knew but felt obliged to suppress, have long been necessary. Dr. Ryskamp brings to his task a wide-ranging scholarship and remarkable perspicuity. He goes back to the original sources from which Hayley and Greatheed drew their information, testing every statement, setting down the facts in so far as they are discoverable, and filling in the background of Cowper's life at Westminster, the Temple, and Huntingdon. His documentation is exceedingly thorough, though his method of combining a number of references in a single footnote is sometimes confusing. He handles his narrative skilfully, weaving the episodes into a connected story, writing with zest and ease and compelling our interest by his perceptive comment. He does not attempt a portrait, but shows us Cowper's state of mind at different times and the qualities which he displayed under the pressure of changing circumstances. His short biographical sketches of Cowper's school friends and his literary friends of the Nonsense Club, including the disreputable Chase Price who is now almost certainly identified with the 'Toby' and 'C. P. Esq.' of the early letters and poems,

are many of them extremely well done. He has discovered new facts about Theadora, concerning whom Hayley and John Johnson felt obliged to preserve a complete silence: that she herself suffered from the family melancholia and was probably the 'near relation' mentioned by Cowper as taking his place when he left Dr. Cotton's mental home at St. Albans; that despite his unbroken silence about her in his letters, Cowper told Hayley that he had preserved an 'intense affection' for her throughout his life, a piece of information suppressed by John Johnson when he edited Hayley's *Memoirs*. He throws new light on Cowper's breakdown in 1763 by giving the full story of the background struggle between the minor clerks and Ashley Cowper as the holder of the sinecure office of Clerk of the Parliaments. Cowper had good reason to be apprehensive of the ordeal of public examination; his suspicions of personal and family guilt and the ambiguity of his attitude towards patronage and 'placemen', at a time when he needed all the confidence and strength of purpose he could muster, almost certainly contributed to his collapse. The final chapter on his recovery at St. Albans and his life with the Unwins at Huntingdon does not go much beyond what is already known, but Dr. Ryskamp incorporates Greatheed's account of the 'conversion' of the Unwins by Cowper which was dismissed by Southeby in a footnote and overlooked by Wright and most of the later biographers.

Twenty new letters or fragments of letters, written between 1750 and 1767, with eight new poems early and late are printed in appendixes. The new poems are unimportant armchair verse, with one striking exception. This is a youthful poem almost certainly contributed by Cowper at the age of eighteen to *The Student, or the Oxford Monthly Miscellany* for January 1750, in which several of the lines, the metaphoric pattern of shipwreck and storm, and the theme of rejection and despair are strongly suggestive of some of his later verse, particularly of *The Castaway* written nearly fifty years afterwards. It is highly probable that he contributed to magazines other poems and essays which are not now discoverable. His most substantial early work, a translation of four cantos of the *Henriade*, was identified by the reviewer of *The Task* in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December 1785 as a part of the Smollett-Franklin translation of Voltaire's *Works* and this was confirmed by Cowper himself. But both Hayley and Southeby, who was misled by Hayley, thought that Cowper's translation had appeared in a magazine and no later biographer has so far succeeded in discovering it, despite a reference to the statement in the *Gentleman's Magazine* by H. P. Stokes in his *Cowper Memorials* (1904), which was noted by Professor Quinlan in his *Life of Cowper* (1953). Dr. Ryskamp now clears up the confusion with considerable ingenuity, pointing to the rival translation by Purdon as the source of Hayley's mistake and confirming the statement made by the reviewer in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

Three of Dr. Ryskamp's tentative attributions to Cowper seem to me doubtful. The evidence, which is purely circumstantial, for his suggestion that Cowper may have written or revised the epitaph on Wolfe for the monument in Westerham church is unconvincing. The epitaph was reprinted in magazines and anthologies and generally admired; if Cowper had written it the fact would surely have become known and the epitaph would have found its way into his

collected poems. There seems no sufficient reason to reject the local and family tradition that the author was the Rev. George Lewis, Vicar of Westerham, who is known to have published occasional verse. I can see very little resemblance between the *Ode to Peace* (1758), which Dr. Ryskamp puts forward as a possible candidate for one of the missing contributions by Cowper to the *Annual Register*, and Cowper's later poem on the same subject. The earlier poem was reprinted in the *St. James's Chronicle*, many years afterwards, on 4 October 1783, over the initials *I.G.* Finally the arguments for Cowper's authorship of the letter signed *Eusebia* which appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for March 1791 are not altogether conclusive.

Dr. Ryskamp has found another broadside version of *Here's a health to honest John Bull*, a song of the early 1790's which Falconer Madan ascribed to Cowper. This is the third contemporary version known to me; there are others dating from about 1815 and 1831 and as late as 1851 it was quoted as a drinking song in Borrow's *Lavengro*. The attribution cannot be ruled out with certainty, but if Cowper had written a song which became so popular one would have expected him to mention it and either Hayley or John Johnson to discover it.

It remains to be said that the book is delightfully well produced by the Cambridge University Press.

N. H. RUSSELL

Shelley's Prometheus Unbound. A Variorum Edition. Edited by LAWRENCE JOHN ZILLMAN. Pp. xx+792. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1959. \$15.00.

'It is the purpose of the present edition of *Prometheus Unbound* to bring together all of the important material, textual and critical, that can in any significant way assist the reader of the poem.' One must admire the diligence and the fair-mindedness with which Professor Zillman has performed his task. When so much is given in these 800 pages it may seem churlish to ask for a little less; but I am not convinced that a variorum edition planned in quite this way is the best method of helping towards the understanding of a difficult poem.

In his introduction Mr. Zillman surveys the criticism of the poem, alluding to the views of innumerable writers on many different aspects of it. The result is more confusing than enlightening. The trouble is that one is never able to see any one critic's interpretation or assessment of the poem as a whole. The editor is aware of the difficulty. 'Some authors', he says, 'may well object that their work has been unhappily abbreviated, its general significance largely lost in the segregation of details.' This difficulty might have been overcome if he had been more selective, first surveying briefly in his own words the history of critical opinion on the poem and then considering as wholes the interpretations of those who have attempted extensive studies of it and have contributed anything of value. Instead of summarizing, in bits, the views of so many writers he might have added notes to his bibliography making clear what, if anything, of importance is contributed by each. Interpretations of the poem as a whole can only be assessed and compared as wholes. Interpretations of particular passages, how-

ever, can be usefully summarized and juxtaposed in notes on those passages, as they are here.

In the textual apparatus also I think the editor might have been more selective. He gives a good account of the textual history of the poem in his introduction. He considers that no altogether satisfactory text has yet been achieved. He does not attempt to provide one, but to give the reader the means to make one for himself. He prints the (admittedly imperfect) 1820 text in scrupulous detail and lists the variants from it of the Bodleian Manuscript (though I believe he has not drawn into his net quite all the relevant manuscript material in the Bodleian), of Mrs. Shelley's two 1839 editions, and of thirteen subsequent editions down to that of Freeman and Grabo; he includes also a full transcript of Shelley manuscript drafts. I do not see much point in including the conjectures of all these editors, especially of those who worked before the manuscripts were available. All we need to have in full, surely, is those items which have authority—i.e. 1820, the manuscripts, and Mrs. Shelley. If these alone were given in full we should be able to see our way more clearly. The conjectures of editors, when of any possible value, could be dealt with in the textual notes.

In the critical notes the editor brings together comments on the *dramatis personae* and on particular scenes and passages. This is the most useful part of the book, and will make it a very valuable work of reference. The editor is very fair in his summaries, and skilful (though, perhaps, too generous) in his choice of quotations. When he allows an opinion of his own to peep through from behind his mass of commentators it is usually a sensible one. This leads one to hope that he will not always be content to provide materials for others. His work is presumably directed towards a better text and a more comprehensive interpretation than any we have now. Perhaps he will attempt to give us one or both of these himself?

P. H. BUTTER

Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. Vol. III, 1807–1814, pp. lii+544; Vol. IV, 1815–1819, pp. xii+545–1,000. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. £5. 5s. net.

It is pleasant to record that Professor Griggs's splendid edition is becoming more obviously indispensable as it unfolds. The present volumes, the middle pair of the projected six, contain 580 letters, and a third of these have not been printed before. This makes a striking contrast with the first two volumes where the proportion of new letters was not much higher than one-sixth. Once again, and mainly through the recovery of the manuscripts which had been presumed lost in the theft of E. H. Coleridge's famous box of papers, over 80 per cent. of the letters are printed from holograph.

Collation of the present text with manuscript sources (holographs and transcripts) has not been possible, but one gains some idea of the quality and quantity of Mr. Griggs's labours by comparing his text with that printed by E. H. Coleridge in 1895, and with his own earlier text of 1932, in cases where he was dependent on E. H. C.'s transcripts. There is scarcely a page on which misreadings

or omissions or wilful alterations have not been rectified; and while Mr. Griggs inclines to overscrupulousness in rendering faithfully S. T. C.'s petty slips and idiosyncrasies, he also rescues the student from the danger of mistaking Coleridge's meaning, or misjudging the emphasis of his total argument, in a number of places; for the undependability of earlier texts was a serious nuisance. The capricious spellings and abbreviations, the ugly rash of capitals, the defacing of the printed page in order to distinguish single, double, and treble underscoring—all this is a small price to pay for a text reliable enough to sustain the close scrutiny which Coleridge's informal prose is nowadays receiving.

For this reason—and we should add the authoritative redating of a number of letters—the importance of Mr. Griggs's work extends far beyond the material which he now prints for the first time. His editorial tact is also commendable: annotation is full, never obese. His headnotes are models of clarity and relevance. The two volumes, like their predecessors, are paged and indexed as a unit. Volume III's list of abbreviations and principal references is repeated in Volume IV, but not its list of letters—which is a slight inconvenience.

The letters as a whole are unimpressive. Mr. Griggs, who gave us an anxious moment in his introduction to Volume I when he called Coleridge 'the greatest thinker of his age', has no illusions as to the lack-lustre writing or the sprawling argument, often so diffuse as to try the reader's patience intolerably. These letters are of a piece with Coleridge's middle years of home-shifting, money-scraping, scattered endeavours. They will be read for information rather than pleasure. Of what is new, the most interesting part concerns the *Biographia Literaria*; the two-year history of angry bargaining is almost clear at last. Mr. Griggs's introduction surveys the course of Coleridge's addiction to opium, very fully documented in the letters which follow. These thousand pages leave the received view of Coleridge unaltered in essentials, but lavishly amplified.

JOHN JONES

The Maturity of Dickens. By MONROE ENGEL. Pp. xiv+202. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 25s. net.

Mr. Engel's book is divided into two parts. In Part I he prints revised versions of two articles which have appeared in periodicals, one an investigation into Dickens's artistic beliefs, and the other an investigation into his literary beliefs; in Part II he groups the novels into four chapters and examines what he calls their 'multiple construction', that is, the control exercised by Dickens over intricate plots and great social themes, and 'the less overt control of the obsessive private themes'.

Part I is in the nature of prefatory background for the exercise in criticism undertaken in Part II. It serves to prepare the reader's mind for what is to come, even if it cannot be said to be closely integrated with the second Part. The principal sources are Dickens's published letters and his two periodicals, *Household Words* and *All the Year Round*: little or no use is made of his speeches or of his other minor writings. Since the frequency of reference to the periodicals in

footnotes seems intended to give an impression of completeness, it is unfortunate that there should be, to take two examples at random, no reference in the discussion of disease, crime, ignorance, and poverty (p. 51) to the speech at Manchester on 5 October 1843 and the speech to the Metropolitan Sanitary Association on 10 May 1851, or to the speech of 9 February 1858 in the discussion of charity (p. 56). In using contributions to *Household Words* and *All the Year Round* Mr. Engel produces evidence to show that Dickens regarded opinions expressed in those periodicals as though they were his own. This lessens the need of determining authorship. On several occasions, however, Mr. Engel is at pains to point out that an article has been attributed to Dickens by Kitton. It is strange he should not know that, so far as *Household Words* is concerned, the office-book survives; in it he would have discovered the authorship of every article.

The novels are surveyed in Part II in 114 pages, of which approximately 14 are occupied by quotation. The essay is not lacking in perception; though Mr. Engel shows less in 114 pages than Professor Bodelsen in an 11-page article in *English Studies* (December 1959). Had the book appeared fifteen years ago, it might have been singled out as a portent of what was to be expected during the years to come as critics responded to the lead given by Edmund Wilson in *The Wound and the Bow*; but today Mr. Wilson's disciples are legion, and there is not enough individuality in Mr. Engel's approach to distinguish him from the rest.

But there is an even graver objection to be mentioned. Short as the book is it is full of misstatements, misapprehensions, and unqualified assertions.

1. 'Dickens is likely to start a work of fiction easily', writes Mr. Engel (p. 11). Against this must be set letters in which Dickens complains of 'the agonies of plotting and contriving a new book' (*Martin Chuzzlewit*; 12 November 1842), of 'writing slowly' (*Dombey and Son*; 28 June and 5 July 1846), of his hand being 'out . . . today and yesterday I have done nothing' (*David Copperfield*; 19 April 1849), of 'the wild necessity of beginning to write, the not being able to do so' (*Bleak House*; 7 October 1851), of the crushing difficulties of space (*Hard Times*; February 1854), of 'the wandering—unsettled—restless uncontrollable state of being about to begin a new book' (*Little Dorrit*; 4, 8, 11, 21, 24 May 1855), of having 'hit upon nothing for a story. Again and again I have tried' (*Our Mutual Friend*; April 1862), of being 'in the preliminary agonies' (*Edwin Drood*; 18 October 1869).

2. '. . . the homely and peculiar English names of the sort Dickens is most likely to give to his characters' (p. 13). No one doubts the appropriateness of Dickens's names; but as to their homely and peculiar English quality, there is more truth in the sarcasm which Aytoun published in *Blackwood's* (November 1846): old familiar names 'are utterly proscribed among us, and . . . a new race has sprung up in their stead, rejoicing in the euphonious appellations of Tox and Wox, Whibble, Tooze, Whopper, Sniggleshaw, Guzzlewit, Gingerthorpe, Mugswitch, Smungle, Yelkins, Fizgig, Parksnap, Grubsby, Shoutowker, Hogswash, and Quiltirogus'.

3. 'He was at great pains to choose proper illustrators for his novels' (p. 16).

This obscures the fact that once Dickens had chosen Browne during the course of *Pickwick Papers*, he continued to work with him for nearly twenty years in every twenty-part monthly serial up to and including *Little Dorrit*. The choice had become almost automatic.

4. 'Dickens learned about poverty in the least desirable way, by being a poor child' (p. 49). Poverty is a relative term, and John Dickens is well known to have spent some time in a debtors' prison. But Mr. Engel's sentence opens an exposition of Dickens's views on pauperism and the operation of the New Poor Law. A reader might suppose that Dickens lived as a child on the level of the Plornishes.

5. Lancashire is not an 'industrial city' (p. 69).

6. It was not burlesque 'hunting' scenes, but sporting scenes for which Dickens was asked to write sketches at the beginning of his career (p. 75).

7. *Pickwick Papers* was not issued in two or more volumes (p. 82).

8. The name of the undertaker who employed Oliver Twist was not 'Sowerby' but 'Sowerberry' (p. 90).

9. *Barnaby Rudge* was not 'first conceived for *Master Humphrey's Clock*' in 1841, but had been in mind since 1836 (p. 95).

10. Dotheboys Hall was emphatically not a Ragged School in the usual sense of the term (p. 97).

11. Although one may accept the description of Jo (p. 118) as a 'child already old with knowledge of the ways and miseries of the world', one cannot agree that Guppy and Smallweed are 'repellent examples of the same type', because they are not children.

12. Dickens did not write in his notes for *Bleak House*, chapter xxix: 'Then connect Esther and Jo' (p. 119). In the following number-plan, opposite Chapter xxxi, he wrote 'Connect Esther and Jo? Yes.'

13. It is imprecise (p. 123) to describe Mr. Bayham Badger as priding himself on the 'gentility' of his wife's former husbands, and to class Mrs. Pardiggle with Mrs. Jellyby in finding it 'easier to do good deeds at a distance than to do their duty close by'. Mr. Bayham Badger's pride was in the fame, not the gentility, of his wife's former husbands, and in so far as Mrs. Pardiggle's deeds were good, they were done close by in the brickmaker's cottage (Mr. Engel mentions Mrs. Pardiggle's visit, but calls the brickmaker a 'bricklayer', p. 122).

14. It seems more probable that Esther Summerson was drawn from Georgina Hogarth than that she was 'created as some kind of *alter ego*' for Dickens himself (p. 124).

15. The place where the Plornish family lived was called 'Bleeding-Heart Yard' not 'Bleeding Heart Court' (p. 129).

16. It is misleading to contrast the graver mood of *Great Expectations* with the lighter mood of *David Copperfield* and use in evidence the different attitudes towards Australia, 'a Utopia for Mr. Peggotty and the Micawbers . . . a place of hard exile for Magwitch' (p. 147). The point should not be made without allowing for the difference of imagined time between the two novels. *David Copperfield* ends at the time of writing, a time when families were being helped and encouraged by the Family Loan Colonization Society to begin a new life

in Australia; *Great Expectations* belongs to the period 1807-26 (see Mary Edminson, 'The Date of the Action in *Great Expectations*', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, June 1958) when Australia was still a convict colony.

This is a record of imprecision in writing, of misreading, and of insufficient scholarship. The critical conclusions of a writer who permits so many blemishes to stand in so short a book will necessarily be regarded with a suspicious eye. He cannot expect a cordial welcome.

JOHN BUTT

The Novels of George Eliot. By BARBARA HARDY. Pp. xii+242. London: Athlone Press, 1959. 25s. net.

The sub-title of this book is 'A Study in Form'; but this ought not to be given more than a limited weight. Certain aspects of George Eliot's fiction have been omitted from the discussion, but it is not easy to point to anything which is relevant to a critical appreciation of that body of work but is omitted here because it is excluded by the word 'form'. That word, in fact, is being used in its widest sense, to include whatever is relevant to the novels as organized, articulated, imaginative wholes. In other words, this book is a general critical study of the novels, and at least in intention a comprehensive one.

As such it is perceptive and suggestive, and thoroughly useful. This is partly because Mrs. Hardy operates easily and firmly with the numerous techniques developed in recent decades for sophisticated discussion of fiction: patterning out a moral scheme through character, irony, the shifting interplay of scenes, figurative language, the exact quality of the author's presence, and so on. More important, the reader finds himself convinced that the discussions are based on a very unusual degree of familiarity with the novels themselves: a familiarity unusual both for its detail and for the thoughtful intimacy which seems often to have dwelt upon this detail. Criticism which is the product of ingenious interpretation or insistent discrimination may strike the reader as more ambitious or central than what he will find here; but it can also, and easily, settle back soon after it is read into the merely clever or arbitrary. Mrs. Hardy's best points permanently enrich one's reading of her originals, and this is high and solid praise. Among many possible examples, I would point to her evidence for George Eliot's considered assessment of Stephen in *The Mill on the Floss* (p. 55); her noticing how the novels are deepened by a sense of unfulfilled possibilities in the characters' lives (pp. 136, 168); her account of how the author creates a continuum, as it were, of normality out of which the main action is to arise (p. 185); and much of the discussion of figurative language, especially the novelist's use of the bleak room as a symbol of the negative in normality.

The weakest note of the book is almost the corollary of its richness. Looking at detail as carefully and sympathetically as this, it is easy enough to relax one's sense of when detail succeeds and when it fails. George Eliot's conception of life's 'ordinariness' is a main part of her vision at its best. It cannot be 'enlivened' by 'melodrama' (p. 30): either melodrama is the wrong word, or the

enlivening is a blemish. In the pages on *Romola*, Piero's painting, Tito's condemnation of the *campanile* of Giotto, Nello's sketch of the satyr, Magdalene and Stoic, are all discussed as having an 'important function', as being 'full of suggestiveness' or 'very elaborate and oblique forecasting', without its being said at all that these efforts for symbolism are laboured failures. In the chapter on 'The Pathetic Image', Tina's being likened to a 'little southern bird' and so forth is examined in great detail—'the apparently sentimental image has a complex effect—but the fact that complexity and effectiveness are present in this story only in intention is left blurred. Again, it is disquieting to read, in the discussion of how characters are arranged to constitute a structure of values, 'we acquire the trained eye which picks out the Morality Play in the domestic scene' (p. 99). The relation of this kind of analysis to criticism looks oblique, and the reader's disquiet is sharpened by reference to the 'vast converting influence' of characters like Dinah, Felix, and Deronda, or to their having 'the simplicity and great stature of abstractions in a Morality Play, and something of their majestic power' (pp. 100–1). I hope that these points do not seem niggling; but as such things recur in the book, they build up in the reader's mind a sense that the critical touch behind it is not altogether certain, and that some of what he is reading ought perhaps to be called contingent analysis of the novels: analysis of the contribution which detail would make, were it not, as it does this time, to disappoint. This response is confirmed, perhaps, by one puzzling phrase: 'we lose a great deal, as critics and perhaps as readers, if we do not . . .' (p. 9). What distinction is implied by that 'perhaps'? Certainly, it could be a harmless one; but the reader is left unsure that it is so.

There is one major omission. 'Form', in Mrs. Hardy's wide sense (but one always relevant to criticism), seems often to come in George Eliot's fiction through the novel's being in part an acting out of ideas: or rather, of theories and principles about character and life and conduct which kindled her imagination because she was abreast of the newest contemporary insights. *Silas Marner* is organized, in respect of its very plot, around current insights into man's relation to his environment and the individual man's relation to the group. *The Mill on the Floss*, from one point of view, is organized around the twin ideas (both of which George Eliot would naturally have seen with a contemporary nuance) of resignation and self-realization. A Benthamite and an anti-Benthamite sense of conduct seem to be polarities in *Middlemarch*. These things are part of what lies behind the great controlling drives in the actions of George Eliot's fiction. They are therefore, of necessity, central to form in her books. They cannot be elucidated save in a thoroughly historical study which would bring out just how abundantly she poured 'the best that was known and thought' in her own time into her fiction. Surprisingly, Mrs. Hardy offers little more than a few inconclusive hints in this whole field; but there is reason to think that she would survey it well, and I hope that, in due course, she will try.

JOHN HOLLOWAY

The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Edited by HUMPHRY HOUSE. Completed by GRAHAM STOREY. Pp. xxxiv+580. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 63s. net.

The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Edited by CHRISTOPHER DEVLIN, S.J. Pp. xiv+370. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 42s. net.

This successor to the *Notebooks and Papers* contains a good deal of new material. The Early Diaries, of which only extracts appeared in 1937, are printed in full; there are five more undergraduate essays, and there is the portion of the Journal from 2 May 1866 to 19 July 1868, forty-eight pages long in this edition, which Fr. D. A. Bischoff discovered in 1947. In 1937 House printed six sermons, but in *The Sermons and Devotional Writings* there are twenty more, and the rest of the book ('Spiritual Writings' and 'Isolated Discourses and Private Notes') is new, except for four items printed by House. Fr. Devlin's task of arranging and explaining these devotional pieces has been carried out in exemplary fashion. For each of the three Parts of his volume he supplies a solid but sympathetic and light-handed introduction, which relates the material to Hopkins's life, or vocation, or theology, and does so with much balance and fair-mindedness. There is little in the newly published writings in this volume that can directly enhance the poet's literary status. House had already printed the best of the sermons, of which at least one (23 November 1879) was certainly an addition to English sermon-literature. Elsewhere, much of the material is both technical and obscure, as was to be expected of the theological notes and exercises which Hopkins wrote for himself alone. The Meditations on Death and Hell remind one of nothing so much as the sermon that induced Stephen Dedalus's nightmare-fantasy and fit of vomiting in *A Portrait of the Artist*. The editor, who himself cites Joyce in connexion with the Meditation on Hell, confines himself to coolly observing the likeness of the two pieces in rhetorical method. It would beg too many questions simply to regret on his own behalf Hopkins's choice of life, but there is much in this volume that makes one deplore that such a way of life was there for him to choose. There is no doubt, however, that researchers into Hopkins's poetry will find these writings fiercely relevant to their pursuit, and they will be properly grateful to his Society for permitting their publication.

Humphry House's edition of the *Notebooks and Papers* was surely one of the most distinguished books ever to be devoted to the *disjecta membra* of a great poet. Its successor is, by comparison, rather like a fine leather wallet that has been crammed a little too full; it has lost the fastidious elegance of outline and no longer awakens quite the same excitement. Such a change was inevitable, and the present work, although it lacks the pioneering grace of House's first sortie, plainly results from a major scholarly operation, in which large forces have been deployed and a wide front opened up. The accuracy of the transcription I have not had an opportunity to check, but it is doubtless meticulously done, and the reader is at least not brought up short (as happens sometimes even with the

admirable editions of the Letters) by what appear to be obvious mistranscriptions. There are forty-two pages of plates, and a catalogue of the manuscripts at Campion Hall showing what essays and papers remain unpublished there; Dr. John Stevens contributes a forty-page Appendix on Hopkins as a musician, and Mr. Alan Ward provides a long series of 'Philological Notes' (which, however, confine themselves to the 'philological' entries in the Early Diaries); Mr. John Piper writes on the drawings. The editorial commentary on the Diaries and Journal is extremely full.

There will be divergent views about this amplitude, as Mr. Storey recognizes (p. xxviii). Some will applaud his decision and be entirely ready to repudiate the common custom of deprecating the scholarly zeal that occupies itself with the minutiae of a great writer's life and times. It is not as though these editors are giving us information which is easily—if at all—available elsewhere to the ordinary reader of Hopkins. It was an editorial duty, for example, to write notes on the pictures which Hopkins saw at Kensington and elsewhere; because many of the paintings are forgotten, the task was bound to lead into by-ways. Of great value are the annotations on what Hopkins saw when he visited such places as St. Albans, for there have sometimes been changes since. And when Hopkins has the cryptic entry (6 August 1867) 'Judgement pronounced against Mrs. Thwaites' will', what is an editor to do? He cannot maintain Cordelia's silence for fear of being rebuked for his 'ponderous tongue', but must try to tell us the story, and sometimes, as in this case, the story is long and complex and requires a long note. The editors' knowledge and command of their sources in such often obscure and intricate matters are awe-inspiringly particular, and one has the satisfaction of contemplating work that seems done once and for all. The full biographical notes on the poet's family and associates, which form the backbone of the commentary, are invaluable. In general, these editors are very good at judging when they have arrived at the point where the reader's need to know is satisfied and at stopping there. Even they do not, of course, answer all the possible questions: what, for example, is the historical event behind the anecdote of the Queen and the Shah (17 July 1873), and why is there an exhaustive note on Tichborne but none on the Army Purchase Bill (pp. 217–18)? If the commentary has a minor weakness, it may be that it is a little sparing with cross-references: for example, Hopkins refers at length to Basil Poutiatine (the 'Pontiatine' of *Letters to Bridges*, second impression, p. 21) and his father the Admiral on page 229 of the Journal, but there are no cross-references to the two previous mentions of Basil or to the notes on the Admiral and his son on pages 367 and 366. A graver matter is the virtual silence of the commentary on Hopkins's vocabulary, and in general it shuns the task of verbal exegesis. Editorial help is needed, it would seem, with a passage such as this, from a description of cloudscape, 21 April 1871:

Later / moulding, which brought rain: in perspective it was vaulted in very regular ribs with fretting between: but these are not ribs; they are a 'wracking' install made of these two realities—the frets, which are scarves of rotten cloud bellying upwards and drooping at their ends and shaded darkest at the brow or

tropic where they double to the eye, and the whiter field of sky shewing between: the illusion looking down the 'wagon' is complete.

It would be easy to offer long lists of words from the Journal alone, which remain unglossed and which cannot be found in any dictionary, some of them first occurrences of words used in a special sense, which recur in the letters and poems, others coinages for an immediate purpose of description, and so on. It is, after all, this freshness with words, reaching out to the freshness which Hopkins perceived 'deep down things', that singles the Journal out from all other documents of a like kind; it is their 'idiom':

I have no other word yet for that which takes the eye or mind in a bold hand or effective sketching or in marked features or again in graphic writing, which not being beauty nor true inscape yet gives interest and makes ugliness even better than meaninglessness. (p. 195)

If it is not easy, without more aid than we are given, to watch the growth of such vital words as *instress*, or *bidding*, or *keeping*, it is not much easier, despite the generally lavish nature of the commentary, to grasp the history of G. M. H. Mr. Storey has a curious passage in his preface on this point:

It is thought that those who love him and want to study him carefully will prefer to have many facts or clues to facts and sources presented here, together with his own Journals, rather than submit to the necessity of reading a biography to find them out. (p. xxviii)

There are, it is true, some entries in the commentary which have something of the vividness and imaginative participation in the life of the subject which we hope for in a biography (for example, the paragraph on Manresa House on page 401); but however much it is adorned with passages of this kind, a commentary is precluded by its nature from giving us what an interpretative biography can give us. Neither the *Journals and Papers* nor Fr. Devlin's collection, fine as they both are, can be a substitute for the art of the biographer, for his ordering and interpretation of the experiences of the life against the background of the times, and his total vision of them. Their very excellence reminds us with fresh force of the biography that we have lost by House's untimely death.

PETER URE

The Art of Rudyard Kipling. By J. M. S. TOMPKINS. Pp. xiv+278. London: Methuen, 1959. 25s. net.

This thoughtful and scholarly book is something new in Kipling studies. It is neither a biography nor an *apologia* nor, as the author herself states, 'a critical enquiry in the strictest sense of the term'. It might be described as an exploration of Kipling's literary personality, which, as Miss Tompkins points out, 'is not to be equated exactly with that of the man'. In Kipling's lifetime the two subjects most discussed by his critics were probably his poetry and his politics. Miss Tompkins deliberately avoids both these highly controversial topics. She is concerned mainly with Kipling as a writer of prose fiction and for her the

culmination of his literary career is to be found in his later stories which she describes as 'adult masterful art, suitable to my generation'.

Her study is roughly chronological. It begins with an analysis of Kipling's early attempts to produce a full-length novel. Here the comparison drawn between *Kim* and *Huckleberry Finn* is particularly illuminating. After a short interlude on Kipling's comic vision entitled 'Laughter' she passes to a long and masterly discussion of 'The Tales for Children'. These three opening chapters form a prelude to a series of studies of different aspects of the great body of Kipling's stories under such headings as 'Simplicity and Complexity', 'Hatred and Revenge', 'Healing', and 'The Man and the Abyss'. A concluding chapter called 'Change and Persistence' is a sort of *coda* containing some interesting suggestions about Kipling's 'sources'.

This is not an easy book to read. It is based on a truly encyclopaedic knowledge of Kipling's writings, and, even with the help of the excellent chronological bibliography, close concentration is needed to follow the involutions of the argument and appreciate the vast array of allusions to characters and incidents in the stories. The style, moreover, is not always helpful. It tends often to be clogged, intricate, and slow moving, though occasionally the author's enthusiasm gives it fire and energy. The book is certainly not one to be chosen as an introduction to Kipling for neophytes. Nevertheless, those who already have some knowledge of his writings are strongly recommended to make the considerable effort of attention necessary to carry them through these closely packed pages. They will be rewarded by some highly stimulating critical insights, which should do much to encourage that 'impartial study' of Kipling's later writings for which Miss Tompkins pleads on the last page of her book.

V. DE S. PINTO

The Critical Writings of James Joyce. Edited by ELLSWORTH MASON and RICHARD ELLMANN. Pp. 288. London: Faber and Faber, 1959. 25s. net.

It was a mistake to call this collection of fugitive writings the 'critical writings' of Joyce. The proportion of criticism is extremely small. Much space goes to translations of Joyce's Italian lectures and articles on Home Rule, Fenianism, Parnell, and Ireland generally, and to miscellaneous reviews from the *Daily Express*; there is also an interview with a racing motorist, and a leading article on foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland. The volume is not made more of a volume of literary criticism by the inclusion of the cloacal *Holy Office* and *Gas from a Burner*. But though the editors may have erred in their piety in making their collection in the form it takes, there can be no quarrel about their editorial work. An introduction to each item gives a complete and accurate account of provenance and background, and the fullest possible relation of the item to Joyce's ideas and main published writings. The annotation is very full. (The reader for the English publishers might possibly have advised the editors to change the note which says that 'His Master's Voice' is 'the name of the English branch of Victor recordings'.)

Several pieces in the collection are of great interest, and they are mostly early

work (though it is very pleasant to have the text of the late, Finnegansian, 'From a Banned Writer to a Banned Singer'). There are schoolboy essays and undergraduate themes, muddled perhaps by fine writing. Most valuable are the lecture on 'Drama and Life', given at University College in 1900, the review of *When We Dead Awaken* from the *Fortnightly Review*, the famous 'The Day of the Rabblement', and an undergraduate review of Munkacsy's painting, 'Ecce Homo' (1899). These have value in their own right, beside the interest they have in showing us Joyce feeling towards the views on art we know so well. In 'Drama and Life' he denies that the didactic or moral purpose is the essence of art, debunks romance, and writes: 'I think out of the dreary sameness of existence, a measure of dramatic life may be drawn.' The review of Ibsen is the only true piece of criticism in the collection; it is a brilliant 'hearkening' to the play: 'hearkening', says Joyce at the end, 'is the only true criticism'. Joyce exhibits the play, rather than explains it.

From the later material, one must be content with what crumbs one can find. Joyce champions Crabbe, 'One of the most neglected of English writers'; the lecture on Blake is most disappointing. Of Hardy's poetry Joyce writes, 'je dois vous avouer que je l'ignore complètement'. It should be added that the important Paris and Pola notebooks (printed by Gorman) are here reprinted.

One feels about all the critical material as one feels about the writings on Ireland: everything important that Joyce ever thought about was refined into its ultimate state in his main published writings. Everything he did, saw, wrote, or thought about was moving towards its fulfilment in *The Portrait of the Artist*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake*. It is in those works that the critical writings of James Joyce are to be found.

PHILIP EDWARDS

Textual and Literary Criticism. By FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. x+186 (Sandars Lectures in Bibliography 1957-8). Cambridge: University Press, 1959. 22s. 6d. net.

This book, representing the Sandars Lectures of 1958 and a paper read to the Bibliographical Society during the same visit to England, is not, as a whole, agreeable work. The status of bibliography is not increased by belittling other studies which play an essential part in textual criticism and it will fall into disrepute if the claims made for it are exaggerated or ill-founded.

The first chapter ('Textual Criticism and the Literary Critic') is mainly concerned with the modern period and a particular school of literary critics, and I have no quarrel with Professor Bowers's contention that common sense, as well as common prudence, is a necessary part of a critic's equipment. The second chapter ('The Walt Whitman Manuscripts of *Leaves of Grass* (1860)') gives a considered account of the bibliographical history and literary significance of manuscripts which Mr. Bowers was invited to edit by their American owner and its substance is not merely interesting but exciting. It is in the third and fourth chapters ('Textual Criticism of Shakespeare' and 'Principle and Practice in the editing of Early Dramatic Texts') that he seems to run amuck—largely, I suspect,

because these were hurried work—and it is because the latter part of this book seems to jeopardize the status of bibliography that I must join issue with it.

Its weaknesses as a presentation of the case for bibliography can be illustrated by its observations on the text of *Romeo and Juliet*. In *Studies in Bibliography IX* (1957) two of Mr. Bowers's students reached the conclusion that, except for a couple of pages which were set up from Q 1, the copy for Q 2 was Shakespeare's foul papers. George Williams, one of the writers of this article, has now, we hear (pp. 88–89), noticed a marked increase in the number of words capitalized in Q 2 from III. v on, and on this evidence he has arrived at the tentative conclusion that the latter part of Q 2 'represents an earlier and rougher form' of Shakespeare's manuscript. I suspect that Mr. Bowers may here have accidentally set the cart before the horse, but this is not my point. What I complain of is the bibliographer running before his horse to market; for it should have been noticed before the 1957 article was written that this heavier capitalization in Q 2 is matched by the same phenomenon in sheets E–K of Q 1 (notably in the work of one of the two compositors who set them) and that this suggests a closer connexion between these quartos than the article allowed for. We may reasonably ask why a study of Q 1 and Q 2 capitalization was not made at the outset and also why it is now supposed that the capitalization of printed texts was Shakespeare's. There is no evidence that he ever used capitals to any extent and there is some that he did not, since errors in transmission presuppose that he did not capitalize the beginning of verse lines or sentences and that he even wrote proper names with a minuscule. If bibliography claims to rest on firm foundations, it should have something better than shaky foundations like these to build on.

In view of the recent interest in setting by formes, we may also reasonably ask whether Q 2's juggling with the number of text-lines to the page (to which catch-words, stage directions, and verse lining bear witness) was due to the setting of the outer forme before the inner, especially since this would explain the setting of the bulk of the Queen Mab speech as prose. We need, in short, a strictly bibliographical account of this quarto which editors can relate to the literary evidence. The young bibliographer may brush the latter aside, but it represents the kind of check on the bibliographer which the latter claims to provide on the literary critic. Each has his responsibilities, and the bibliographer, in setting a pace which outruns discretion, will lose ground instead of gaining it.

I must join issue finally with an example of Mr. Bowers's editorial principles. He would expect the Q 2 compositor's errors in *Romeo and Juliet* to be relatively few when setting from print; hence, he argues, the New Shakespeare editors of *Romeo and Juliet* were illogical and unprincipled in emending more freely in what they believed to have been set up mainly from print than in what they believed to have been set up from manuscript. The fact is, of course, that an editor with two authorities which are in fairly close agreement (as Q 1 and Q 2 are whenever Dover Wilson and Duthie found a bibliographical link between them) is always in a position to emend with greater confidence than when he has a single authority or authorities which differ substantially. On Mr. Bowers's premisses we ought to emend very many more errors in Roberts's *Merchant of Venice* than we find in his reprint of *Titus*. That we do emend very many more

in his *Hamlet* is mainly due to the evidence of Q 1 and the Folio text. While we await evidence for the grounds of the belief that the *Romeo and Juliet* compositor's errors in reprints were 'relatively few', we shall do well to remember that the number of errors in reprints may range from as few as 20 or 30 to well over 200 and that, on the figures for the *Richard III* quartos, Creede's standards were poor.

We may one day know much more than we do about the transmission of Elizabethan dramatic texts, but it would be foolish to suppose that bibliography will displace the older (and maturer) disciplines of linguistic and literary criticism. What we need to be sure about is where one way of tackling problems ends and another begins. Mr. Bowers confounds all and even tries to impose bibliographical inferences on the lexicographer and phonologist. For instance, he rightly objects (p. 152) to Kökeritz's having cited the Folio's 'mockry' instead of Q 1's 'mockery' (*M.N.D.*, II. i. 111) in a list of words with a disyllabic pronunciation (see Kökeritz, p. 376). But this does not mean that Kökeritz was wrong in supposing that the elision was intended, because the evidence for it is metrical, not orthographical. The very lesson to be learnt from Kökeritz's lists is that metre is a better guide to pronunciation than spelling. Indiscriminate tilting of this kind will do bibliography no good. It has its place in textual criticism, but it should not be so much all over the place as in these chapters. We have often been told that textual critics must learn to understand bibliographical evidence, but the bibliographer should try to understand linguistic and literary evidence.

ALICE WALKER

The Place-Names of Derbyshire. By KENNETH CAMERON. Part I, pp. lxxiv+186; Part II, pp. viii+187-514; Part III, pp. viii+515-830 (English Place-Name Society 27, 28, 29). Cambridge: University Press, 1959. 35s. each.

The Place-Names of Derbyshire fills 830 pages in three volumes, more space than has been needed for any other county so far in the English Place-Name Society's survey. The increase in size is caused largely by the inclusion of very many more minor names than have been recorded in previous volumes, and Dr. Cameron may be congratulated on the thoroughness of his treatment of them. Not only such minor names summarily considered as have always been thought worthy of mention are included, printed as always in normal type, but also for each parish two lists, one of field-names recorded in modern sources (usually after 1750), with if possible earlier forms as well, the other of unidentified minor names from earlier sources; these two lists are printed in the smaller type hitherto used for street-names. Inevitably, very many of these minor names are of little linguistic or historical value, but occasional ones reveal elements hitherto unrecorded such as **forca**, **repe** ME., **rest(e)**, **scanca**, **set-hlaw**, **sporðr**, **wir-born**, and from late names **grindelstan**, **reille**, **teyntur**, **tod-hole**. Others carry back the earliest recorded use; thus **hut** is carried back to ME. times. It is in these minor names that a group of interesting lead-mining terms principally occurs—**belland**, **cacklemackle**, **coe**, **jagger**. (Regrettably, the Lead-Mining Glossary presumably referred to on pp. 110, 113, 140, &c., is not identified in

the Bibliography.) The major names too contain a number of elements not recorded in Professor Smith's *English Place-Name Elements* (*E.P.N.*)—*æöele*, **bagge** ME., **bole** ME., **bought** dial., **bræd**, **campania** MedLat., **castellaria** MedLat., **cauel** ME., **cave** OFr., **ceafl**, **chambre** OFr., **chauntour** ME., **cotmann**, **deofol**, **dyngja** OS scand., **fæsc**, **gleemann**, **græfel**, **hæðig**, **hefon**, **kaup** ON., **losc** PrW., **mam** Irish, **nāu-** Brit., **parcel** ME., **pebro-** Brit., **pin**, **sælig**, **slipor**, **spink** ME., **trega**, **wuducoce**. If only one or two of these are of any great interest, that is hardly to be wondered at. The Director of the Survey has made his interim summing-up, with most of this Derbyshire material available to him, too recently for us to expect any major discoveries or changes. Dr. Cameron does, however, dispute the suggestion, first made in *The Place-Names of Sussex* (1929), p. 37 n. and repeated in *E.P.N.*, p. 184, that **torr** was a loan-word into Derbyshire from the south-west.

Through Derbyshire ran two boundaries on whose detailed course place-names might have been expected to throw light, the political boundary between Mercia and Northumberland in Old English times, and the linguistic boundary between the West Midland and East Midland dialects of Middle English. On the boundaries of the Mercian kingdom, though at an early date and without particular reference to that with Northumbria, Dr. Cameron makes some tentative suggestions, based on the phonology of one or two OE. words and the ME. developments of others, with the reasonable though tacit assumption that Mercian speech characteristics imply Mercian political power. The Derwent, he thinks, probably formed the eastward limit of Mercian territory except in North Derbyshire, where an eastward extension is found. As will be noticed, Mercian has the narrower meaning suggested by Map 5 in *E.P.N.*, rather than the wider one suggested by the maps of such historians of the language as Baugh and Brunner, and is presumably to be differentiated from Anglian (p. xl ix); yet at least twice (pp. liii and lxxiv) Anglian is clearly meant to include Mercian. This confusion in terminology is a legacy from *E.P.N.* that will continue to cause trouble. On the later linguistic boundary the Notes on the Dialect seem to confirm the approximate line suggested by the Moore-Meech-Whitehall survey.

The boundaries of the county in earlier times were poorly defined, and within modern times there have been frequent adjustments of parish and even of county boundaries. This produces difficulties not only for the collector of place-names, but also for the cartographer. Though Dr. Cameron deals competently with them, he is poorly served by his major map, an Ordnance Survey 'Combined Index' overprinted in red with hundred boundaries and transferred parishes, which could well have been replaced by a specially drawn map like that for Nottinghamshire, with cartographical technicalities removed and river-lines, so important for the comprehension of the introduction, clearly marked. The neat and clear distribution-maps facilitate comparison with other counties, since they are on the same scale, show the distribution of many of the same elements, and usually (but unfortunately not always) use the same symbols for them.

It is encouraging to see that a north-west midland county has been thoroughly and competently surveyed to the high standards and by the scientific methods of the E.P.N.S. As one fills in diagonal cross-hatching for Derbyshire on Map 1

nts not
æðeile,
ellaria
r ME.,
eofon,
t., pin,
ese are
of the
material
changes.
Place-
r was a

place-
between
boundary
h. On
without
tentative
and the
in that
erwent,
except
sticed,
than
Baugh
); yet
arian.
ue to
em to
survey.
within
county
names,
with
joined
shes,
t for
es, so
neat
they
and
ap I

ighly
ds of
ap I

in *E.P.N.*, one cannot but be impressed by the evidence of steady and persistent advance in such a work of scholarship over so many years, and look forward confidently to the ultimate completion of the survey.

HENRY HARGREAVES

SHORT NOTICES

Paradise Lost as 'Myth'. By ISABEL GAMBLE MACCAFFREY. Pp. viii+230. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 36s. net.

This book contains good and interesting criticism marred, to my sense, by the thesis announced in its title. Mrs. MacCaffrey has chosen to hitch her wagon to modern investigations and theories of the nature and significance of myths, relying largely in this matter on quotations from Ernst Cassirer and others. This is a pity, since she has much to say on the meaning, structure, language, and imagery of *Paradise Lost* which in no way depends for its force on her nominal thesis; indeed her recurrent attempts to attach her analyses of various aspects of the poem to her thesis are usually obtrusive and obfuscating. Not that her views on the poem as myth would have been valueless if they had been kept subordinate; it is simply that they fail to provide a main theme for her criticism. Nevertheless, her book is well worth reading for its many true perceptions. In particular I liked her remarks on Milton's treatment of time and eternity in Heaven, Hell, and Paradise; on the multiple references and meanings in the similes, and their structural value; on the nature of innocence in unfallen man; and on the role of Satan.

B. A. WRIGHT

John Drydens rhetorische Poetik. By MAX NÄNNY. Pp. xviii+102 (Swiss Studies in English 49). Bern: Francke, 1959. Fr. 12.00.

By 'rhetorisch' Dr. Nanny means 'geprägt von der klassischen Kunst des Überzeugens der griechisch-römischen Antike; ausgerichtet auf eine überwältigende moralische Beeinflussung eines gewissen Publikums'. The first section of his essay is an able survey of the 'rhetorical' tradition which Dryden inherited, and of the *genera—iudicale, deliberativum, demonstrativum*—in which so much of his political and satiric work was done. In his second section Dr. Nanny investigates Dryden's attitude to the Ancients and to traditional theories of the function of literature. His discussion of 'nature', imitation, and the relation of instruction and delight is notably thorough. Towards the end his treatment is too summary; Dryden's notion of satire in particular deserves much fuller critical elaboration. But the essay is an intelligent, well documented, and easily written account of important literary principles, and a pointer to the kind of synthesis which is now badly needed in Dryden studies.

JAMES KINSLEY

The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift. Vol. 13. Directions to Servants and Miscellaneous Pieces 1732-42. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Pp. xliv+234. Oxford: Blackwell, 1959. 30s. net.

This is the eleventh volume to appear of the admirable fourteen-volume edition of Swift's prose which Professor Davis has carried through with such accuracy and erudition. Neither the introduction nor the critical apparatus falls below the high standard of its predecessors. The centrepiece is *Directions to Servants* and in its presentation to the

reader there is a nice marriage between the introductory discussion of the printer Faulkner's claim—made in the 1745 preface to his Dublin edition of *Directions to Servants*—that he possessed some drafts of the work in Swift's autograph, and the notes to the text now offered by Mr. Davis. For implicit behind all the careful textual argument is a clear and firm understanding of Swift's aims in writing and his method as a satirist. Mr. Davis emphasizes Swift's characteristic adoption of an ex-footman as his spokesman (after he had once thought of using a butler) and not only gives due weight to the significance of Swift's long preoccupation with the idea of the work but also supplies us with plausible reasons why the work was never completed by the ageing Dean weighed down by ill health, despondency, and grave public concerns.

Similarly, a careful balance is maintained between editorial exactitude, background information, and unobtrusive critical assessment in the dozen or so shorter pieces which make up the rest of this volume. What emerges most clearly is Swift's double aim of protecting Ireland against English extortion and of exhorting the Irish to tidy up their own affairs in social and economic matters. Much more than the *Directions to Servants* these political pieces helped me to understand and recognize the gap which divided the man from the satirist; for frequently, in Swift's plain speaking on public affairs, one can sense the forthright anger and troubled compassion which, because of his persistent artistic craving for a mask, lie beneath the arcane irony of his more polished writings. Particularly in the *Prefaces to Swift's Works, 1735, Vols. I, II and IV* and in *Concerning the universal hatred against the Clergy, May 24, 1736* one glimpses unmistakably the character of Jonathan Swift breaking through the *persona* of the Drapier and the satirist. Finally, the *Will of Dr. Swift, 1745* and numerous other references to financial details and economic affairs in this volume should give pause to those who are too ready to assume a close connexion between the 'rise of the novel', Dissent, and the growth of capitalism. Swift's interest in these matters was as acute, as informed, and as profitable as, say, that of any of Defoe's characters; one doubts whether he would have acquiesced in being called a Dissenter.

Such considerations as these, critical and artistic, which arise strictly from the most careful scholarship lying behind this volume point to a skilful and praiseworthy editorial understanding of the need to preserve unity of theme within the boards of a single volume in a series of collected works.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

William Wordsworth: The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind. Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Second Edition revised by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Pp. lxxiv+650. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 75s. net.

It is a pleasure to have this indispensable book again printed from type on laid paper instead of on the hard and heavy sheets of the lithographic reprints of recent years. The careful and discreet hand of the reviser can be seen throughout, and most consistently in the text and apparatus. There are several corrections to the text of 1805-6 (e.g. I. 284, 426; IV. 331; VI. 107; VII. 20, 61; VIII. 114, 212-13, 514; IX. 299-300; X. 421, 571; XII. 339; XIII. 3, 104, 212); and the apparatus, as well as recording from manuscripts unknown to de Selincourt or inadequately handled by him, gives the fruits of a reconsideration of others, notably M, from which over thirty new or corrected readings appear. Significant new textual material appears in the apparatus or notes to I. 663; II. 1, 434/435; IV. 400-504; V. 370-7; XIII. 1-119 (previously printed in *T.L.S.*, 18 October 1957), 68-72. Perhaps most important, an Appendix prints *in toto* the relevant parts of MS. JJ. Here, however, there seems some confusion of purpose, since the apparatus to Books I and V records spasmodically the readings of JJ (including one, I. 279, which is not supported by the Appendix), as if an intention to record JJ in the apparatus had been superseded by the decision to print the whole elsewhere.

Early sections of de Selincourt's introduction have been rewritten. The descriptions of the manuscripts he used are now more precise, and similar descriptions are added of those

which he did not know or used only in reissues of the book. The growth and chronology of the poem are rehandled in Sections 2 and 4; the treatment is, again, more precise than de Selincourt's, and than Miss Darbishire's own in *The Poet Wordsworth* (Oxford, 1950), on which it is based.

The most important new notes are those which add or discuss new textual material, e.g. II. 434/435; IV. 400–504; XIII. 1–119. Others clarify biographical problems of varying importance. It is still possible to add Miltonic reminiscences to those collected here and in R. D. Havens's *The Mind of a Poet* (Baltimore, 1941). Cf. I. 485–6 with P.L., VII. 22–23 (cited by Havens) and P.L., IV. 592–5; VI. 614 with *Comus*, 723; VII. 687 with P.L., II. 625; VIII. 81–85, reading A², 'involved With . . . mists', with P.L., IX. 75; X. 378, 'unjust Tribunals', with S.A., 695; XI. 383–5 with P.L., VII. 364–5, a passage quoted directly in *The Convention of Cintra*.

The following points need attention in subsequent printings: p. xxxiv (misplaced brackets); textual notes to II. 343 (misprint), III. 501 (recording MS. D, which according to the preceding note is here obscured), XII. 327–8 (sigla omitted); notes to v. 209 (misquotation retained from de Selincourt), XI. 283 (the reference should now be to 'E.L., p. 3'), XII. 185–204 (read 'Christabel notebook'?).

W. J. B. OWEN

Outlines of Classical Literature for Students of English. By H. J. ROSE. Pp. xiv + 304. London: Methuen, 1959. 16s. 6d. net.

Professor Rose has supplemented his well-known *Handbooks* with a lucid and compendious account of the Greek and Latin literatures intended for those whose knowledge of them is exiguous. He perhaps intended a larger work, for he says that he proposes to follow the treatment of each ancient author with 'an account of those who have used him well or ill in producing their own works'; but in fact he does not. There is no mention here of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, of Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, of Yeats's translations from Sophocles. However, though Mr. Rose has not himself applied his learning to the illumination of English literature, he has provided a useful guide to the classics for 'the general reader' and, no doubt (as the publishers cynically observe), for 'the literary critic desirous of displaying classical erudition'.

One minor adverse criticism might be offered. It seems perverse, in a work intended for readers of English literature, to disguise the gods and heroes of Greek mythology in a transliteration unfamiliar and perplexing. Hektor is recognizable enough, and so are the Kyklopes and even Alkaios (as the inventor, presumably, of Alkaiks); but what about Kirke? Is this the glossator of the Shephearde's Kalendar? And if Mr. Rose's attendant spirit asks

Who knows not Kirke
The daughter of the Sun?

I am afraid the answer will be 'most of Milton's readers'.

JOHN BUXTON

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 78, Heft 1, 1960

Die Terminologie des mittelalterlichen Dramas in bedeutungsgeschichtlicher Sicht (E. Wolff), 1-27.
The Sources of John Joscelyn's Old English-Latin Dictionary (J. L. Rosier), 28-39.
Structure and Style in Some Minor Religious Epics of the Seventeenth Century (A. Esch), 40-55.
Coleridge, Bowles, and 'Feelings of the Heart' (L. Werkmeister), 56-73.
Donne's *Hymne to God, my God, in my sickness* (A. Esch), 74-77.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. xii, No. 1, Winter 1960

Addison's Ballad Papers and the Reaction to Metaphysical Wit (A. B. Friedman), 1-13.
The Pilgrim Journeys of Bunyan and Heinrich Jung-Stilling (L. M. Price), 14-18.
Inglis' *Rambles*: A Romantic Tribute to *Don Quixote* (W. U. McDonald, Jr.), 33-41.
The Novels of Samuel Beckett (M. J. Friedman), 47-58.
Beckett, Dante, and Geulincx (R. Cohn), 93-94.

DUQUESNE STUDIES—ANNUALE MEDIEVALE

Vol. i, 1960

Sir Thomas Wyatt's Wordplay (W. H. Wiatt), 96-101.
Desiderata in Anglo-Norman-English Linguistics (H. H. Petit), 102-7.

ENGLISH

Vol. xiii, No. 74, Summer 1960

The State of English (H. S. Davies), 44-48.
New Bearings in Donne: *Aire and Angels* (A. J. Smith), 49-53.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xli, No. 3, June 1960

English Grammars in Dutch and Dutch Grammars in English in the Netherlands before 1800 (G. Scheurwegrhs), 129-67.
Some Aspects of Satire in Wycherley's Plays (T. W. Craik), 168-79.
Some Aspects of Virginia Woolf's Imagery (I. Simon), 180-96.
A ME. Wheel of Fortune Poem (R. H. Bowers), 196-8.

Vol. xli, No. 4, August 1960

On the Authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy* (I.-S. Ekeblad), 225-40.
W. B. Yeats and W. J. Turner 1935-37 [Concluded] (H. W. Häusermann), 241-53.
Comments on Visser's Notes on the ME. Dictionary (H. Kurath and F. Th. Visser), 253-5.
English Actors in the Netherlands 1600-10 (J. George), 255-7.
An Unnoticed Latin Poem by Thomas Randolph, 1633 (L. Forster), 258.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. x, No. 1, January 1960

English in the University: II (A. Rodway and M. Roberts), 1-17.
A Note on 'To be or not to be' (C. C. Clarke), 18-23.
The Structure of *All's Well that Ends Well* (S. Nagarajan), 24-31.
The Escape from Pollution. A Comment on *Comus* (D. Wilkinson), 32-43.
Johnson's *Journey*: History as Art (J. Hart), 44-59.
The Hero's Guilt: the Case of *Great Expectations* (J. Moynahan), 60-79.
The Critical Forum: Prose and Poetry and Mack; The Machiavell and the Moor, 114-17.

Vol. x, No. 2, April 1960

The Merchant of Venice: A Reconsideration (G. Midgley), 121-33.
The Morality of Revenge: Tourneur's Critics (T. W. Tomlinson), 134-47.
Coleridge's Formal Criticism of Shakespeare's Plays (M. M. Badawi), 148-62.
The Structure of Imagery in *Harry Richmond* (B. Hardy), 163-80.
Gnosers to the Grinsdown [Review article on Joyce] (A. Rodway), 181-94.
The Critical Forum: Fortune in Wyatt's 'They Flew From Me'; H. Bloom on *The Triumph of Life*; An Unpublished Wyatt Poem; The Machiavell and the Moor, 220-38.

MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. vi, No. 1, Spring 1960

Critical Studies on Robert Penn Warren, 3-88.

Vol. vi, No. 2, Summer 1960

Dostoevsky and Dreiser (F. J. Hoffman), 91-105.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 457

Winesburg, Ohio: Art and Isolation (E. Fussell), 106-14.

Joyce and Meredith (D. Fanger), 125-30.
The Narrator as Centre in *The Wings of the Dove* (L. Bersani), 131-44.

'Gimmick' and Metaphor in the Novels of William Golding (J. Gindin), 145-52.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxv, No. 3, March 1960

Kyning-wulðar and *mann-skrtlatt* (S. Einarsson), 193-4.

Spenser's Letter to Raleigh: a Reply (W. J. B. Owen), 195-7.

The Devil and Pharaoh's Chivalry (J. M. Steadman), 197-201.

The Motif of the Wise Old Man in *Walden* (W. B. Stein), 201-4.

The Two 'Voices' in *Huckleberry Finn* (E. A. Robinson), 204-8.

Awkward Ages in *The Awkward Age* (S. Cooney), 208-11.

The Ambassadors and *Louis Lambert* (J. W. Gargano), 211-13.

Linguistics in a Strait-Jacket (H. Sperber), 239-52.

Vol. lxxv, No. 4, April 1960

The River Guyon (A. D. S. Fowler), 289-92.

The Genesis of Donne's Dreams (D. C. Allen), 293-5.

Infernal Illumination in Poe (O. Evans), 295-7.

Civil Disobedience: The Way to Walden (D. W. Kleine), 297-304.

Browning Letters to the *Pall Mall Gazette* (M. M. Bevington), 304-9.

Arnold's 'Eternal Not Ourselves' (E. L. Williamson, Jr.), 309-12.

The Structure of *The Turn of the Screw* (D. P. Costello), 312-21.

A Liturgical Pattern in *Ulysses* (J. J. Peradotto), 321-6.

Vol. lxxv, No. 5, May 1960

Beowulf, II. 1408 ff. (K. Kee), 385-9.

A Possible Addition to the Sidney Canon (E. G. Fogel), 389-94.

Coleridge's Use of Cathedral Libraries (P. Kaufman), 395-9.

Browning's *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister* (M. K. Starkman), 399-404.

Peter Quince's Orchestra [Wallace Stevens] (N. F. Ford), 405-11.

Vol. lxxv, No. 6, June 1960

Weohstan's Sword (R. E. Kaske), 465-8.

'Brave Prick Song': An Answer to Sir Thomas Browne (C. Maddison), 468-78.
Something More About Rochester (L. Hook), 478-85.

Wordsworth on Byron: An Unpublished Letter to Southey (C. L. Shaver), 488-90.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xxi, No. 2, June 1960

A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for 1959 (P. A. Brown), 99-121.

Appreciating Whitman: *Passage to India* (J. Lovell, Jr.), 131-41.

Shakespeare's *Consolatio ad Exile* (J. L. Tison, Jr.), 142-57.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. lv, No. 3, July 1960

The Meaning of Chapman's *Tragedy of Chabot* (I. Ribner), 321-31.

Suckling and Davenant Satirized by Brome (R. J. Kaufmann), 332-44.

'As Dew in April' (B. C. Raw), 411-14.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lvii, No. 4, May 1960

The *un*-Prefix: A Means of Germanic Irony in *Beowulf* (R. B. Shuman and H. C. Hutchings II), 217-22.

The Conclusion of the 'Marriage Group': Chaucer and the Human Condition (D. R. Howard), 223-32.

Dekker's Gentle Craft and the Lord Mayor of London (D. Novarr), 233-9.

Fielding and 'Conservation of Character' (J. S. Coolidge), 245-59.

Connectives in *The Seafarer* and *The Dream of the Rood* (W. F. Bolton), 260-2.

'A Septuagenarian Poet': An Addition to the Matthew Arnold Bibliography (R. L. Brooks), 262-3.

S.T.C. in his Letters (K. Coburn), 264-8.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

44ste Jaarg., Afl. 3, Juli 1960

The Fox, the Ape, the Humble-Bee, and the Goose (A. G. Pettit), 208-15.

Pope and Lucretian 'Anonymity' (W. B. Fleischmann), 216-17.

'From the Safe Shore': Milton and Tremellius (J. M. Steadman), 218-19.
Middeleeuwen en Latijn (J. Engels), 221-33.

The Religio-Philosophical Orientations of Vondel's *Lucifer*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Grotius's *Adamus Exul* (H. Bekker), 234-44.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lxi, No. 1, 1960

Nochmals zur 'Banane' (M. Wis), 58-62.

A Note on 'thing' in *Havelok the Dane* (G. C. Britton), 77-79.

-ing Forms in the Service of Rhythm and Style in Virginia Woolf's *The Waves* (I. Rantavaara), 79-97.

NINETEENTH CENTURY FICTION

Vol. xiv, No. 4, March 1960

Charlotte Brontë, Reason, and the Moon (R. B. Heilman), 283-302.

Hawthorne's *Blithedale*: The Function of the Narrator (W. L. Hedges), 303-16.

Hawthorne and Dimmesdale (C. R. O'Donnell), 317-32.

Myths of Character: An Aspect of the Novel (A. L. Laski), 333-43.

Bleak House and Dickens's *Household Narrative* (P. A. W. Collins), 345-9.

The Golden Navel: The Cabalism of Ahab's Doubloon (J. D. Seelye), 350-5.

Lewes's Review of *Wuthering Heights* (A. R. Brick), 355-9.

The Origin of Original Sin in Hawthorne's Fiction (B. A. Marks), 359-62.

Vol. xv, No. 1, June 1960

The Statue of Baring-Gould as a Novelist (W. J. Hyde), 1-16.

James's *Four Meetings*: Two Texts Compared (V. Tartella), 17-28.

Darwin and the Novel (L. Stevenson), 29-38.

'Cruel Devourer of the World's Light': *The Secret Agent* (E. B. Gose, Jr.), 39-51.

Gissing and Schopenhauer (C. J. Francis), 53-63.

Narrative Perspective in *Pride and Prejudice* (E. M. Halliday), 65-71.

George Moore and *Father and Son* (C. Burkhardt), 71-77.

Proper Names in *Villette* (G. S. Dunbar), 77-80.

A Further Note on the Dickens-Poe Relationship (H. W. Webb, Jr.), 80-82.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. vii, N.S., No. 6, June 1960

John Evelyn: Mr. W. G. Hiscock's Account, 203-6.

Translating Ovid in Chaucer's *House of Fame*, 206-7.

Who is the Old Man in *The Pardoner's Tale*?, 207-8.

'In Case That': an Antedating, 208.

'Art Poetical' in *The Kingis Quair*, 208-10.

A Skelton Reference c. 1510, 210-11.

Thomas Churchyard, 211-15.

Madrigal Verses from Whitney's *Choice of Emblems*, 215-16.

Nashe's Authorship of *An Almond for a Parrat*, 216-17.

Dictionary Entries from the 1611 Du Bartas, 217-20.

Mammon and 'Heaven's Pavement' [*Paradise Lost*, I. 682], 220.

Cerberus in *L'Allegro*, 220.

Chaucer, Milton, and the Rev. William Stukeley, M.D., 220-2.

Samson as the Fallen Champion in *Samson Agonistes*, 222-4.

Libertines and Puritans, 224-6.

Dame Grace Knatchbull and family Connections, 226-9.

Two Spencers, 231-2.

Words from Maria Edgeworth, 232-3.

The Ghosts in Eliot's *The Elder Statesman*, 233-5.

Vol. vii, N.S., No. 7, July 1960

John Evelyn: Mr. W. G. Hiscock's Account, 243-8.

'Roma' and 'Anglia': Survival of a Poetic Image, 248-50.

'Prototype', 250-1.

Four Early Animals not in *O.E.D.*, 251-2.

Wordsworth and Hugh Blair, 254-5.

Checklist of Primary Sources of the Byron-Jeffrey Relationship, 256-9.

Shelley's Ahasuerus and Milton's Satan, 259-60.

Caleb Williams and *The Cenci*, 260-3.

Notes to Hazlitt's Writings against the Phrenologists, 263-4.

Hawthorne and Sidney's *Arcadia*, 264-5.

Coventry Patmore's 'Signatures', 266.

Henry James and Saintine, 266-8.

An Unpublished Letter of Edward Martyn, 268-9.

Emily Dickinson and Brazil, 270-1.

Vol. vii, N.S., No. 8, August 1960

John Evelyn: Mr. W. G. Hiscock's Account, 284-6.

N. and M. in the Book of Common Prayer, 286-8.

'Lord Bacon' in the Eighteenth Century, 288.

Defoe and the Machine-Smashers, 288-90.

Defoe's *Tour* and Macky's *Journey*, 290-2.

Pope and 'Appius', 292-4.

Pope and Boileau, 294.

James Hervey, 294-5.

Fielding, Hearne, and Merry-Andrews, 295-7.

Ferdinand Count Fathom and *La Vida del Buscón*, 297-9.

Another Letter from Smollett to Dr. William Hunter, 299-301.

Attacks on the *Critical Review* in the *Literary Magazine*, 300-1.

W. B. Yeats: Corrigenda, 302-3.

The Garrick-Mrs. Cibber Relationship, 303-5.

Mr. Yorick and the Minster Library, 308-10.
 Some Words from *Pride and Prejudice*, 312.
'Astronautics', 312-13, 283.
 Byron and Churchill, 315-16.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxix, No. 2, April 1960
 The Romantic Movement: A Selective and Critical Bibliography for 1959, 133-223.
 Issues and Motivations in the Nashe-Harvey Quarrel (D. Perkins), 224-33.
 Morris's Guenevere: An Interpretation (L. Perrine), 234-41.
 A Note on Hawthorne's Juveniles (A. C. Kern), 242-6.
 The Mind of Vardaman Bundren (F. C. Watkins and W. B. Dillingham), 247-51.
 William Smith and *The Shephearde's Calender* (L. A. Sasek), 251-3.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xxi, No. 3, Spring 1960
 The Literary Career of William Faulkner: Catalogue of an Exhibition (J. B. Meriwether), 111-64.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

Vol. lxxv, No. 2, May 1960
 Research in Progress for 1960, 83-133.
 Annual Bibliography for 1959, 135-422.

Vol. lxxv, No. 3, June 1960
 Chaucer's Eagle: A Contemplative Symbol (J. M. Steadman), 153-9.
 The Personality of Chaucer the Pilgrim (J. M. Major), 160-2.
 Freud on Shakespeare (N. N. Holland), 163-73.
 Wordsworth: Poet of the Unconquerable Mind (B. Weaver), 231-7.
 'Symbolical Language' in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (E. B. Gose, Jr.), 238-44.
 Hazlitt on the Poetry of Wit (W. P. Albrecht), 245-9.
 Hawthorne's Fair-Haired Maidens: The Fading Light (V. O. Birdsall), 250-6.
 Melville and his Chimney (S. C. Woodruff), 283-92.
 Henry James's *Capricciosa*: Christina Light in *Roderick Hudson* and *The Princess Casamassima* (M. E. Grenander), 309-19.
 The Early Yeats and the Pattern of History (T. R. Whitaker), 320-8.

Interprétation de *En attendant Godot* (R. Champigny), 329-31.

RESEARCH STUDIES

Vol. xxviii, No. 2, June 1960
 The Role of William Caxton (M. F. Markland), 47-60.

REVIEW OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

Vol. i, No. 3, July 1960
 The Squire's Yeoman (E. Birney), 9-18.
 The Poetry of Sir Walter Raleigh (P. Ure), 19-29.
 Collins's *Ode on the Death of Thomson* (E. M. W. Tillyard), 30-38.
 Wordsworth and the Weather (H. Darbshire), 39-49.
 F. A. C. Wilson on Yeats's Byzantium Poems (W. Empson), 51-56.
 D. H. Lawrence and Blanche Jennings (K. and M. Allott), 57-76.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxviii, No. 3, Summer 1960
 Italian Criticism of American Literature: An Anthology, 353-515.

TEXAS STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE

Vol. ii, No. 1, Spring 1960
 Reading Blake's Lyrics (H. Adams), 18-37.
 The Art and Argument of *The Tyger* (J. E. Grant), 38-60.
 James's *The Sacred Fount* (A. P. Hinchcliffe), 88-94.
 Johnson, Rousseau, and Religion (C. F. Chapin), 95-102.
 The Religion of Pater's *Marius* (B. Duffey), 103-14.
 Four Decades of Howells Scholarship (J. Woodress), 115-23.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxix, No. 4, July 1960
 From Poe to Kafka (L. Hofrichter), 405-19.
 J. S. Mill's Theory of Poetry (J. M. Robson), 420-38.

VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. iii, No. 4, June 1960
 Kipling's Place in the History of Ideas (N. Annan), 323-48.
 The Portrait of *My Last Duchess* (B. N. Pipes, Jr.), 381-6.
 Victorian Bibliography for 1959, 409-49.

UNIVERSITY OF
GLASGOW

EDWIN MORGAN
J. A. M. RILLIE

INDEX

Ælfric. See Ladd, C. A. (art.).
 Alabaster, W., *Sonnets*, ed. G. M. Story
 and Helen Gardner, revd., 323.
Ancrene Riwle, French Text, ed. W. H.
 Trethewey, revd., 421.
 Apollonius. See Goolden, P. (revd.).
 Arnold, M., 'The Strayed Reveller'. See
 Gottfried, L. A. (art.). See Baum, P. E.,
 Jamison, W. A. (revd.).

 Ball, C. J. E., note by, Old Kentish *wig* and
 Middle English *oty*, 52.
 Ballads. See Bronson, B. H. (revd.).
 Barker, R. H., *Thomas Middleton*, revd., 326.
 Baum, P. F., *Ten Studies in the Poetry of*
 Matthew Arnold, revd., 112.
 Bawcutt, N. W. See Middleton, T. (revd.).
 Beowulf. See Bliss, A. J., Brodeur, A. G.,
 Chambers, R. W. (revd.).
 Berger, H. *The Allegorical Temper, Vision*
 and Reality in Book II of Spenser's Faerie
 Queene, revd., 197.
 Bergonzi, B., art. by, *The Publication of*
 The Time Machine 1894-5, 42.
 Berry, F., *Poets' Grammar. Person, Time*
 and Mood in Poetry, noticed, 343.
 Berry, H., and Timings, E. K., art. by,
 Spenser's Pension, 254.
 Berry, L. E., art. by, Giles Fletcher, the
 Elder, and Milton's *A Brief History of*
 Moscovia, 150.
 Bliss, A. J., *The Metre of Beowulf*, revd., 414.
 Bond, R. P. See Periodicals (noticed).
 Bowers, F., *Textual and Literary Criticism*,
 revd., 449.
 Brammer, M. M., art. by, *The Manuscript*
 of The Professor, 157.
Brun Studies in English, Vol. I, noticed,
 236.
 Brodeur, A. G., *The Art of Beowulf*, revd.,
 417.
 Bronson, B. H., *The Traditional Tunes of*
 the Child Ballads, revd., 426.
 Brontë, A. See Gérin, W., Harrison, A.
 (revd.).
 Brontë, C., *The Professor*. See Brammer,
 M. M. (art.).
 Brooke-Rose, C., *A Grammar of Metaphor*,
 revd., 340.
 Brower, R. A., *Alexander Pope*, revd., 433.
 Browning, R. and E. B. *Letters of the Brownings*
 to George Barrett, ed. P. Landis with
 the assistance of R. E. Freeman, revd.,
 109.
 Bullough, G. (ed.), *Narrative and Dramatic*
 Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. II. The
 Comedies, 1597-1603, noticed, 233.

 Burke, E., *Correspondence*, Vol. I, ed. T. W.
 Copeland, revd., 219.
 Burney, C., *Musical Tours in Europe*, ed.
 P. A. Scholes, revd., 434.
 Burney, F. See Hemlow, J. (revd.).
 Burton, M. E. See Wordsworth, M. (revd.).
 Buxton, J., letter by, *Verse and its Feet*,
 305.

 Cameron, K., *The Place-Names of Derbyshire*, revd., 451.
 Campbell, A., *Old English Grammar*, revd.,
 193.
 Carey, J., art. by, *The Poems of Nicholas*
 Hare, 365.
 Carroll, D. R., art. by, *An Image of Disenchantment* in the Novels of George Eliot, 29.
 Carter, H. See Moxon, J. (revd.).
 Cawley, A. C. See *Wakefield Pageants*,
 Chaucer, G. (revd.).
 Chambers, R. W., *Beowulf*, 3rd edn., with
 supplement by C. L. Wren, revd., 306.
 Chapman, G. See Sühnel, R. (revd.).
 Chase, R., *The American Novel and its Tradition*, revd., 114.
 Chaucer, G., *Canterbury Tales*, ed. A. C.
 Cawley, revd., 312; *Troilus*. See Meech,
 S. B. (revd.).
 Clark, C. See *Peterborough Chronicle* (revd.).
 Coleridge, S. T., *Letters*, ed. E. L. Griggs,
 Vols. III and IV, revd., 439; *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. See Ware, M. (note). See Landon, C. (art.).
 Colgrave, B. (ed.), *The Paris Psalter*, revd.,
 307.
 Cope, J. I. See Sprat, T. (revd.).
 Copeland, T. W. See Burke, E. (revd.).
 Cowper, W. See Ryskamp, C. (revd.).
 Craigie, J. See James VI (revd.).
Critical Quarterly, *The*, Vol. I, ed. C. B. Cox
 and A. E. Dyson, noticed, 236.
 Crum, M., note by, *An unpublished Fragment of Verse by Herrick*, 186.
 Cynewulf, *Elene*, ed. P. O. E. Gradaon,
 revd., 61.

 Darbshire, H. See Milton, J., Wordsworth,
 W. (revd.).
 Daunce, E. See Drew, P. (note).
 Davies, H. S., art. by, *Lajaron's Similes*,
 129.
 Davis, H. See Moxon, J., Swift, J. (revd.).
 Dawson, G. E., *The Life of William Shakespeare*, revd., 199.
 de Chickera, E., art. by, *Palaces of Pleasure*:

the Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Translations of Novelle, I.

D'Evelyn, C., and Mill, A. J., *The South English Legendary*, revd., 311.

Devlin, C. See Hopkins, G. M. (revd.).

Dickens, C. See Engel, M., Fielding, K. J. (revd.).

Dobson, E. J. See Robinson, R. (revd.).

Donne, J. See Hasan, M. ul, Keynes, G. (noticed).

Drew, P., note by, Edward Dause and *The Unfortunate Traveller*, 410.

Dryden, J., *Poems*, ed. J. Kinsley, revd., 213; 'Messianic Eclogue'. See Miner, E. (note). See Nanný, M. (noticed).

Dunbar, W., *Poems*, ed. J. Kinsley, revd., 71.

Early English Text Society. See *Ancrene Riwle*, *Kyng Alisaunder*, D'Evelyn, C., Robinson, R., Sisam, C. and K. Ehrenpreis, I., *The Personality of Jonathan Swift*, revd., 92.

Einarsson, S. See Malone, K. (revd.).

Eliason, N. E. See Malone, K. (revd.).

Eliot, G. See Carroll, D. R. (art.), Hardy, B. (revd.).

Elliott, G. R., *Dramatic Providence in 'Macbeth'*, revd., 200.

Ellmann, R. See Joyce, J. (revd.).

Engel, M., *The Maturity of Dickens*, revd., 440.

Fielding, K. J., *Charles Dickens*, revd., 223.

Fink, Z. S. (ed.), *The Early Wordsworthian Milieu. A Notebook of Christopher Wordsworth with a few Entries by William Wordsworth*, revd., 102.

FitzGerald, E., *Rubáiyát*, ed. C. J. Weber, noticed, 234.

Fletcher, G. See Berry, L. E. (art.).

Flower, B. See Maas, P. (noticed).

Foakes, R. A., *The Romantic Assertion*, revd., 105.

Folger Booklets on Tudor and Stuart Civilization, revd., 199.

Fowler, A. D. S., art. by, Emblems of Temperance in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II, 143.

Frank, Jr., R. W., *'Piers Plowman' and the Scheme of Salvation*, revd., 67.

Freeman, R. E. See Browning, R. and E. B. (revd.).

French, J. M., *The Life Records of John Milton*, Vol. V, revd., 431.

Frye, N., and others, *The English Romantic Poets*, ed. C. W. and L. H. Houtchens, revd., 104.

Furniss, W. T., *Ben Jonson's Masques*, revd., 202.

Gardner, H., *The Business of Criticism*, noticed, 344. See Alabaster, W. (revd.).

Garrett, J. (ed.), *More Talking of Shakespeare*, revd., 428.

Gérin, W., *Anne Brontë. A Biography*, revd., 339.

Goldberg, M. A., *Smollett and the Scottish School*, revd., 335.

Goolden, P. (ed.), *The Old English 'Apollonius of Tyre'*, revd., 194.

Gossman, A., and Whiting, G. W., note by, *Comus Once More*, 1761, 56.

Gottfried, L. A., art. by, Matthew Arnold's 'The Strayed Reveller', 403.

Gradon, P. O. E. See Cynewulf (revd.).

Gray, T., 'The Triumphs of Owen'. See Johnston, A. (art.).

Greg, W. W. See Shakespeare, W. 3 *Henry VI*, *Richard III* (noticed).

Griggs, E. L. See Coleridge, S. T. (revd.).

Grivelet, M., *Thomas Heywood et le drame domestique élisabéthain*, revd., 429.

Guthke, K. S., *Englische Vorromantik und deutscher Sturm und Drang. M. G. Lewis' Stellung in der Geschichte der deutsch-englischen Literaturbeziehungen*, revd., 100.

Guthkelch, A. C. See Swift, J. (revd.).

Hardy, B., *The Novels of George Eliot*, revd., 443.

Hare, N. See Carey, J. (art.).

Harrier, R. C., note by, A Printed Source for 'the Devonshire Manuscript', 54.

Harrison, A., and Stanford, D., *Anne Brontë*, revd., 339.

Harvey, P. See *Oxford Companion to French Literature*.

Hasan, M. ul, *Donne's Imagery*, noticed, 233.

Hawthorne, N. See Levin, H. (revd.).

Hemlow, J., *The History of Fanny Burney*, revd., 97.

Herrick, R. See Crum, M. (note).

Heseltine, J. E. See *Oxford Companion to French Literature* (revd.).

Heywood, J., *Ages*. See Schanzer, E. (art.).

Heywood, T. See Grivelet, M. (revd.).

Hopkins, G. M., *Journals and Papers*, ed. H. House, completed G. Storey, and *Sermons and Devotional Writings*, ed. C. Devlin, revd., 445.

House, H. See Hopkins, G. M. (revd.).

Housman, A. E. See Sparrow, J. (note).

Houtchens, C. W. and L. H. See Frye, N. (revd.).

James VI, *Poems*, ed. J. Craigie, Vol. II, revd., 325.

Jamison, W. A., *Arnold and the Romantics*, revd., 226.

Jewkes, W. T., *Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays*, revd., 322.

Johnson, S. See Ricks, C. (note), Roberts, S. C. (revd.).

Johnston, A., art. by, Gray's 'The Triumphs of Owen', 275.

INDEX

Jones, H. W. See Sprat, T. (revd.).
 Jonson, B. See Furniss, W. T. (revd.).
 Joyce, J., *Critical Writings*, ed. E. Mason and R. Ellmann, revd., 448.

Keynes, G., *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne*, 3rd edn., noticed, 118.
 Killham, J., *Tennyson and 'The Princess'*, revd., 225.
 Kinsley, J. See Dryden, J., Dunbar, W. (revd.).
 Kipling, R. See Tompkins, J. M. S. (revd.).
Kyng Alisaunder, ed. G. V. Smithers, revd., 195.

Ladd, C. A., art. by, The 'Rubens' Manuscript and *Archbishop Ælfric's Vocabulary*, 353.
 LaMar, V. A., *English Dress in the Age of Shakespeare*, revd., 190.
 Landis, P. See Browning, R. and E. B. (revd.).
 Landon, C., art. by, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and the *Morning Post*: an early version of 'The Seven Sisters', 392.
 Langland, W., *Piers Plowman*. See Spearling, A. C. (art.), Frank, R. W. (revd.).
Lazarmon. See Davies, H. S. (art.).
 Levin, H., *The Power of Blackness. Hawthorne, Poe, Melville*, revd. 114.
 Lewis, M. G. See Guthke, K. S. (revd.).
 Lewis, W. S., *Horace Walpole's Library*, noticed, 120.

Maas, P., *Textual Criticism*, tr. B. Flower, noticed, 235.
 MacCaffrey, I. G., *Paradise Lost as 'Myth'*, noticed, 453.
 MacDonagh, D. See *Oxford Book of Irish Verse* (noticed).
 McKerrow, R. B. See Nashe, T. (revd.).
 McKillop, A. D. See Thomson, J. (revd.).
 MacLure, M., *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642*, revd., 73.
 Madsen, W. G., *The Idea of Nature in Milton's Poetry*, revd., 202.
 Malone, K., *Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech*, ed. S. Einarsson and N. E. Eliason, revd., 309.
 Marckwardt, A. H., *American English*, noticed, 344.
 Margoliouth, H. M. See Traherne, T. (revd.).
 Mason, D. E., *Music in Elizabethan England*, revd., 199.
 Mason, E. See Joyce, J. (revd.).
 Mason, H. A., *Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period*, revd., 317.
 Meech, S. B., *Design in Chaucer's 'Troilus'*, revd., 314.
 Melville, H. See Levin, H. (revd.).
 Meredith, G., *Periander*. See Tompkins, J. M. S. (art.).

Middleton, T., and Rowley, W., *The Changeling*, ed. N. W. Bawcutt, revd., 82. See Barker, R. H. (revd.).
 Mill, A. J. See D'Evelyn, C. (revd.).
 Milton, J., *Poetical Works*, ed. H. Darbishire, revd., 84; *Comus*. See Gossman, A., and Whiting, G. W. (note); *Paradise Lost*. See Steadman, J. M. (art.), MacCaffrey, I. G. (noticed); *Areopagitica*. See Sirluck, E. (art.); *History of Britain*. See Nicholas, C. (revd.); *Brief History of Moscovia*. See Berry, L. E. (art.); *Life Records*. See French, J. M. (revd.). See Madsen, W. G. (revd.).
 Miner, E., note by, Dryden's Messianic Eclogue, 299.
 Morris, H., *Elizabethan Literature*, noticed, 118.
 Moxon, J., *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing 1683-4*, ed. H. Davis and H. Carter, revd., 332.
 Munro, J. See Shakespeare, W., *The London Shakespeare* (revd.).

Nanný, M., *John Drydens rhetorische Poetik*, noticed, 453.
 Nashe, T., *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow-F. P. Wilson, revd., 319.
 Nicholas, C., *Introduction and Notes to Milton's 'History of Britain'*, revd., 203.
 Nicoll, A. See *Shakespeare Survey* (revd.).

Osgood, C. G. See Spenser, E. (noticed).
Oxford Book of Irish Verse. Chosen by D. MacDonagh and L. Robinson, noticed, 234.
Oxford Companion to French Literature, ed. P. Harvey and J. E. Heseltine, revd., 230.

Paris Psalter. See Colgrave, B. (revd.).
 Partridge, E., *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, revd., 228.
 Periodicals. *Studies in the Early English Periodical*, ed. R. P. Bond, noticed, 120.
Peterborough Chronicle, *The 1070-1134*, ed. C. Clark, revd., 63.
 Pfeifer, J. D., note by, *Waldere* 1. 29-31, 183.
Piers Plowman. See Langland, W.
 Poe, E. A. See Levin, H. (revd.).
 Pope, A. See Brower, R. A., Sühnel, R., Tillotson, G. (revd.).
 Prior, M., *Literary Works*, ed. H. B. Wright and M. K. Spears, revd., 217.

Ray, G. N., *Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom 1847-1863*, revd., 107.
 Reeves, J. See Sharp, C. J. (noticed).
Review of English Literature, A, Vol. I, ed. A. N. Jeffares, noticed, 345.
 Ricks, C., note by, *Notes on Swift and Johnson*, 412.

*The
d., 82.*

Darbi-
man,
Paradise
Mac-
Areopagita.
Britain.
History of
Life
of. See
Asianic
noticed,
the d. H.
London
poetik,
row-
es to
203.
(ed.).
y D.
iced,
ed.
230.
vd.).
228.
glish
120.
34,
-31,
R.
B.
217.
dom.
ed.
and

Ridley, M. R. See Shakespeare, W., *Othello* (revd.).

Roberts, S. C., *Doctor Johnson and Others*, revd., 96.

Robinson, L. See *Oxford Book of Irish Verse* (noticed).

Robinson, R., *Phonetic Writings*, ed. E. J. Dobson, revd., 328.

Rogers, H. L., note by, The Prophetic Label in *Cymbeline*, 296.

Rose, H. J., *Outlines of Classical Literature for Students of English*, noticed, 455.

Rostvig, M.-S., *The Happy Man. Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, Vol. II, 1700-1760, noticed, 119.

Rowley, W., *Woman Never Vext*. See Shapiro, I. A. (note); *The Changeling*. See Middleton, T. (revd.).

Ryskamp, C., *William Cowper of the Inner Temple, Esq.*, revd., 436.

Salisbury Psalter, The. See Sisam, C. and K. (revd.).

Saul, G. B., *Prolegomena to the Study of Yeats's Poems*, revd., 113.

Schanzer, E., art. by, Heywood's *Ages and Shakespeare*, 18; letter by, Verse and its Feet, 192.

Schneider, Jr., B. R., *Wordsworth's Cambridge Education*, revd., 337.

Scholes, P. A. See Burney, C. (revd.).

Selincourt, E. de. See Wordsworth, W. (noticed).

Shakespeare, W., *3 Henry VI*, ed. W. W. Greg, noticed, 232; *Richard III*, ed. id., noticed, 342; *Othello*, ed. M. R. Ridley, revd., 77. See Walton, J. K. (art.); *Cymbeline*. See Rogers, H. L. (note); *The London Shakespeare*, ed. J. Munro with introd. by G. W. G. Wickham, revd., 78. See Schanzer, E. (art.); Elliott, G. R., Garrett, J., Spivack, B., Traversi, D. (revd.); Bullough, G. (noticed).

Shakespeare Survey 11, ed. A. Nicoll, revd., 81.

Shapiro, I. A., note by, *Tityre-tu* and the date of William Rowley's *Woman Never Vext*, 55.

Sharp, C. J., *The Idiom of the People. English Traditional Verse*, ed. J. Reeves, noticed, 121.

Shelley, P. B., *Prometheus Unbound*, ed. L. J. Zillman, revd., 438. See Taylor, Jr., C. H. (revd.).

Sidney, P. See Young, R. B. (revd.).

Sirruck, E., art. by, *Areopagita* and a Forgotten Licensing Controversy, 260.

Sisam, C. and K. (edd.), *The Salisbury Psalter*, revd., 419.

Smith, D. Nichol. See Swift, J. (revd.).

Smithers, G. V. See *Kyng Alisaunder* (revd.).

Smollett, T. G. See Goldberg, M. A. (revd.).

Southern, R., *The Medieval Theatre in the Round*, revd., 316.

Sparrow, J., note by, A Housman 'Reminiscence', 190.

Spearling, A. C., art by, The Development of a Theme in *Piers Plowman*, 241.

Spears, M. K. See Prior, M. (revd.).

Speirs, J., *Medieval Poetry. The Non-Chaucerian Tradition*, revd., 65.

Spenser, E. *Index to Variorum Edition* by C. G. Osgood, noticed, 232. See Berry, H. (art.); *Faerie Queene*. See Fowler, A. D. S. (art.); Berger, H. (revd.).

Spivack, *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil*, revd., 200.

Sprat, T., *History of the Royal Society*, ed. J. I. Cope and H. W. Jones, revd., 215.

Stanford, D. See Harrison, A.

Steadman, J. M., art. by, 'The Tree of Life' Symbolism in *Paradise Regain'd*, 384.

Storey, G. See Hopkins, G. M. (revd.).

Story, G. M. See Alabaster, W. (revd.).

Sühnel, R., *Homer und die englische Humanität. Chapmans und Popes Übersetzungs-kunst im Rahmen der humanistischen Tradition*, revd., 85.

Swift, J. *Prose Writings*. Vol. XIII, ed. H. Davis, noticed, 453; *A Tale of a Tub*, &c., ed. A. C. Guthkelch and D. Nichol Smith, revd., 89. See Ricks, C. (note); Ehrenpreis, I. (revd.).

Taylor, Jr., C. H., *The Early Collected Editions of Shelley's Poems*, revd., 338.

Tennyson, A. See Killham, J. (revd.).

Thackeray, W. M. See Ray, G. N. (revd.).

Theatre Research. Vol. I, noticed, 236.

Thompson, C. R., *The Bible in English 1525-1611*, revd., 199; *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, revd., 199.

Thomson, J., *Letters and Documents*, ed. A. D. McKillop, revd., 93.

Tillotson, G., *Pope and Human Nature*, revd., 87.

Timings, E. K. See Berry, H.

Tompkins, J. M. S., art. by, *Meredith's Periander*, 286; *The Art of Rudyard Kipling*, revd., 445.

Traherne, T., *Centuries, Poems, and Thanksgivings*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revd., 204.

Traversi, D., *Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V*, revd., 75.

Trethewey, W. H. See *Ancrene Riwle* (revd.).

Ure, P., art. by, Yeats's Christian Mystery Plays, 171.

INDEX

Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle, The, ed. A. C. Cawley, revd., 69.

Walders I. 29–31. See Pfeifer, J. D. (note).

Walpole, H. See Lewis, W. S. (noticed).

Walton, J. K., art. by, 'Strength's Abundance': a view of *Othello*, 8.

Ware, M., note by, *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*: A Discourse on Prayer?, 303.

Weber, C. J. See FitzGerald, E. (noticed).

Wells, H. G., *The Time Machine*. See Bergonzi, B. (art.).

Whiteley, M., letter by, Verse and its Feet, 101.

Whiting, G. W., *Milton and This Pendant World*, revd., 329. See Gossman, A.

Wickham, G. W. G., *Early English Stages 1300–1576*, Vol. I, revd., 423. See Shakespeare, W., *The London Shakespeare* (revd.).

Wilson, F. P. See Nashe, T. (revd.).

Wordsworth, C. See Fink, Z. S. (revd.).

Wordsworth, Mary, *Letters 1800–1855*, selected and ed. M. E. Burton, revd., 221.

Wordsworth, W., *The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind*, ed. E. de Selincourt, 2nd edn. revised by H. Darbishire, noticed, 454. See Landon, C. (art.); Fink, Z. S., Schneider, Jr., B. R. (revd.).

Wormald, F., and Wright, C. E. (edd.), *The English Library*, revd., 333.

Wrenn, C. L. See Chambers, R. W. (revd.).

Wright, C. E. See Wormald, F.

Wright, H. B. See Prior, M. (revd.).

Wright, L. B., *Shakespeare's Theatre and the Dramatic Tradition*, revd., 199.

Yeats, W. B. See Ure, P. (art.); Saul, G. B. (revd.).

Young, R. B., *A Study of Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella'*, revd., 202.

Zillman, L. J. See Shelley, P. B. (revd.).

1855,
., 221.
rowth
t, and
nticed,
Z. S.,

), *The*
revid.).

ve and

, G. B.

Astro-

revd.).